The Review of English Studies

Vol. III.-No. 10.

APRIL 1927.

TWO MANUSCRIPTS OF DONNE'S PARADOXES AND PROBLEMS

By EVELYN M. SIMPSON

I

THE text of Donne's Juvenilia, or Paradoxes and Problems, presents a number of difficulties. Many of these are due to the fact that the prose trifles, like most of the poems, were not published till after his death. The paradoxes and problems were circulated in manuscript among his particular friends, but Donne had no intention of sending them to the press. Indeed, he expressed a wish, when sending some of them to a friend, that no copy should be made of these or any other similar compositions.* Even as early as 1600, long before he thought of taking orders, he seems to have felt some anxiety lest his reputation should be damaged by their levity. After his ordination he sought to destroy all his early poems; and probably the paradoxes, as partaking of the same spirit, were included in this condemnation. Hence their first publication was in 1633, two years after Donne's death, and it was not authorised by his literary executors or by his son. It is not clear from what source the publisher, Henry Seyle, obtained the manuscript of the Juvenilia, as he styled the eleven paradoxes and ten problems which he issued in 1633, but it was perhaps the same manuscript from which in 1622 he had printed Donne's "Essay of Valour" and "The True

^{*} See the letter quoted from the Burley MS. in A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne, p. 298.

Character of a Dunce," though without giving the name of their author.*

The book had been licensed by Sir Henry Herbert on October 25. 1632, but on November 14 of the same year an order of inquiry was delivered by the Bishop of London at the King's command. demanding that Herbert should explain before the Star Chamber "why hee warranted the booke of D. Duns paradoxes to be printed." Whatever was the result of the inquiry, it did not prevent the book from being issued in 1633 with Herbert's imprimatur, and later in that year a second edition appeared without any imprimatur, containing an addition of twenty-three lines to the problem "Why have Bastards best Fortunes?" which was likely to be particularly

unpleasing to the Court.+

In 1637 the younger Donne attacked Seyle and others for their unauthorised publication of works pretending to be his father's. and he obtained an injunction from Archbishop Laud prohibiting such publications. However, in 1652 he admitted the genuineness of the pieces by re-publishing the paradoxes and problems issued by Seyle, and adding to them one new paradox, seven new problems, and "The Character of a Scot at the first sight," as well as the "Essay of Valour" and "The True Character of a Dunce." He called the volume "Paradoxes, Problemes, Essayes, Characters, Written by Dr. Donne, Dean of Pauls," and in his dedicatory epistle to Lord Newport he compared these early writings of his father to "The Primroses and Violets of the Spring," which "entertain us with more Delight, than the Fruits of the Autumn."

Since the younger Donne added so much new material, he must have had access to a manuscript of his father's early prose work, but the text of those paradoxes and problems which had appeared in 1633, is substantially the same in the edition of 1652. I have noted one or two trifling differences, such as the omission of a word in the 1652 edition, but a collation of the two texts shows that John Donne followed his usual practice of sending to the printer a printed text of all the material that had already been published.I

• These appeared for the first time in the eleventh edition of Overbury's

Wife, of which in 1622 Seyle took over the printing.

See G. L. Keynes, Bibliography of the Works of Dr. John Donne, pp. 49-54.

For example, when the younger Donne took over the editing of his father's poems in 1650, he added a few pieces of verse and prose, but he did nothing to improve the text of the poems already printed in Marriot's editions of 1633, 1635, 1639, and 1649. See Grierson, *Poems of Donne*, II. lxx.

An exception must be made for the two short pieces which were not included in *Juvenilia*, but had appeared in the Overbury volume. The text of these shows a number of variants which indicate that they were set up afresh in 1652 from a manuscript and not from the printed text.

Thus we have hitherto had but one text of importance for each individual paradox or problem—that of 1633 for eleven paradoxes and ten problems, and that of 1652 for the one paradox and seven problems which first appeared in that edition. The younger Donne did not attempt to correct certain passages in the 1633 edition which are evidently corrupt; he merely reprinted them as they stood. The evidence of any existing manuscripts should therefore be of great importance, provided that it can be shown that they are not derived from the printed text, but represent an independent authority.

Hitherto no attempt has been made to examine the manuscripts from this point of view. As far as I am aware, the only extant manuscript versions of the *Paradoxes and Problems* are found in collections which also contain some of Donne's poems, and the attention of editors has been devoted exclusively to these latter. Through the courtesy of Mr. P. J. Dobell and of the Librarian of the Harvard College Library, I am now able to give a detailed account

of two such manuscripts.

Mr. P. J. Dobell has in his possession a manuscript which formerly belonged to Mr. F. Wyburd, and was used by the late W. C. Hazlitt in his edition (1870) of Thomas Carew's poems in the Roxburghe Library series. Hazlitt printed several poems from it for the first time, but his ascription of them to Carew has been disputed by a later editor. The manuscript (called by Hazlitt the Wyburd MS.) is chiefly a collection of Carew's poems, but its later pages are occupied by a miscellaneous assortment of poetry and prose, of the usual type found in commonplace books of the first half of the seventeenth century. It contains Donne's Elegy to the Lady Bedford, "You that are shee, and you thats double shee," and his "Come Madam come," also the verse paradox "Whoe soe tearmes Loue a fire," and other poems which are attributed to Donne in some manuscripts. These are followed by eight of Donne's prose paradoxes, and nine of his problems. Pages have been torn away in two places, so that portions of two of the paradoxes given are missing, and the end of one of the problems.

The manuscript is written throughout in a large and very clear hand of the middle of the seventeenth century. All the paradoxes and problems present numerous variations from the printed text. Some of these are mere blunders made by the copyist, who seems to have been imperfectly acquainted with Latin, for he frequently makes mistakes in transcribing Latin quotations and proper names. Other variants are due to the scribe's habit of replacing archaic or obsolete forms by those in general use. The majority, however, of the variant readings cannot be explained as copyist's blunders or deliberate normalisations, but must represent a different manuscript original. Some of these readings restore words which had slipped out in the printed text, and thus we are able to emend certain corrupt passages in the Yuvenilia. Others give us alternative readings which suggest that Donne's paradoxes circulated in manuscript in two or three slightly different forms. This would agree with the account given by Professor Grierson of the different manuscript forms of certain of the poems, and his statement of the value of such manuscripts can be applied with equal force to the paradoxes. "Had Donne undertaken the publication of his own poems, such of these manuscript collections as have been preserved—none of which are autograph, and few or none of which have a now traceable history -would have little importance for a modern editor. The most that they could do would be to show us occasionally what changes a poem had undergone between its earliest and its latest appearance. But Donne's poems were not published in this way, and the manuscripts cannot be ignored." " The examination of a large number of manuscripts has shown that it is not probable, but certain, that of some poems (e.g. 'The Flea,' 'A Lecture upon the Shadow,' 'The Good-Morrow,' 'Elegie XI. The Bracelet') more than one distinct version was in circulation. Of the Satyres, too, many of the variants represent, I can well believe, different versions of the poems circulated by the poet among his friends." †

The following is a list of the paradoxes and problems contained in the Wyburd MS. (hereafter referred to as Wy.). I have supplied the numerals in square brackets for convenience of reference.

[•] Grierson, Poems of John Donne, II. lxxviii. † Ibid., cxx.-cxxi.

PARADOXES.

- [1] That all things kill themselues.
- That women ought to painte themselues.

- [2] That women ought to painte themseldes.
 [3] That old Men are more fantastique then Yonge.
 [4] That Nature is our worst guide [page missing, end lost].
 [5] [That a wise man is known by much laughing] [beginning lost].
 [6] That good is more Comon then Euill.
 [7] That by discord things increase.

- [8] That it is possible to finde some virtue in some Women.

PROBLEMS.

- [1] Why are Courtiers sooner Atheists, then Men of meaner Conditions?
- [2] Why doth Sr W. R: write the historie of theis tymes?
- [3] Whye doe great Men choose of all dependants to preferr theire bawdes?
- [4] Whie doth not gold soile the fingers?
- Whye dve none for loue nowe?
- [6] Whye doe young lay-men soe much study Divinity?
- [7] Whye hath the Comon opinion afforded women soules?
- [8] Why are the fairest falsest?
- Why have Bastards the best fortune [end missing, page lost].

The order of both paradoxes and problems is different from that in the printed editions. Paradox 1, "That all things kill themselues," is No. 5 in the editions, but according to the transcriber of the Burley MS., it stood first in that collection also.* No conclusion can be drawn from the fact that we have only eight paradoxes and nine problems, since the manuscript has been mutilated in two places, and we do not know how many leaves are missing. All the paradoxes remaining are among those printed in the first edition of 1633, but the problems include four (Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5) which were first printed in 1652, and one (No. 2) which was not printed till Sir Edmund Gosse included it in his Life and Letters of John Donne. † No. 2 is here in a shorter form than that found in the Bodleian manuscript (Tanner MS, 200, f. 32) from which Sir Edmund printed it.

^{*} The Burley MS., of which Prof. Grierson gives an account (Poems of Donne, II. cx.), contained ten of Donne's prose paradoxes with a covering letter. The manuscript perished in a fire, and the transcript made by Mr. Pearsall Smith of Donne's letters did not include the paradoxes, but the transcriber added a note to the letter on ff. 308-309, "Here follow Donne's Paradoxes' That all things kill themselues ' etc.

[†] II. 52. It has since been reprinted in the Nonesuch edition of Paradoxes and Problemes (1923), p. 68.

The Harvard or O'Flaherty manuscript (hereafter referred to as O'F.) was formerly in the possession of the Rev. T. R. O'Flaherty of Capel, near Dorking. Its general character has been fully described by Professor Grierson in his account of the manuscripts of Donne's poems (Poems, II, xcvii.-xcix.). According to a statement on its title-page, it was "finished this 12 of October 1632." It is primarily a collection of the poems, and the paradoxes with the problems and "characters" come at the end, occupying pages 401-440. Professor Grierson believes that it (or a similar collection) came into the hands of the printer of Donne's poems before the second edition of 1635 was issued, and that he derived from it a number of new poems.* Thus it is an important, though not always accurate, manuscript, and it has had a considerable influence on the text of Donne's poems in the printed editions.

A collation of the text of the paradoxes and problems shows that in this section O'F, has much that is interesting to offer us. Its text is better and more accurate than that of Wv., but in a number of passages it agrees with Wv. against the editions. In some of these instances the two manuscripts give us what is evidently the true text, and enable us to understand passages which were corrupt in the printed text; in others they give us a variant reading which is interesting but cannot be regarded as authoritative. There are also a certain number of passages in which O'F. differs both from Wy. and from the printed text. Some of these are mere copyist's blunders, but others throw light on doubtful or difficult passages.†

O'F. also supplies us with new material—one problem (No. 17) which is not found in any of the printed texts or in Wy., another (No. 18) which is so much enlarged that it is almost a new one, and a third problem (No. 12), which has a different ending from that of the editions. It is clear that O'F. is not a sufficiently authoritative manuscript for us to accept this new material as Donne's without

• "Of the twenty-eight new poems, genuine, doubtful, and spurious, added in 1635, this manuscript contains twenty, a larger number than I have found in any other single manuscript "(Grierson, Poems, II. xcviii.). On p. xcvii. Grierson says, "A considerable number of the errors, or inferior readings, of the later editions seem to be traceable to its influence."

[†] An example may be given from the Problem, "Why hath the Common Opinion afforded Women Soules?" Here the editions read, "The Palpulian Here the entions read, The Papputan Heretikes make them Bishops," a sentence in which Palputian is evidently corrupt. In my Study of the Prose Works of Donne (p. 141, note 2), I showed that the word should be Peputian, i.e. Montanist, Pepuza in Western Phrygia having been a centre of the Montanist heresy. The scribe of Wy. was puzzled by the word and conjectured Apuleyan, which gives us no help. O'F. however reads Puputian, a form much nearer the true text.

question, but I hope to show that the internal evidence for the genuineness of Problems 17 and 18 is overwhelmingly strong.

The following is a list of the paradoxes, problems, and characters found in O'F. The numbers given are found in the manuscript.

PARADOXES.

1. That woemen ought to paynt.

2. That a wise man is knowne by much Laughing.

3. That all things kill themselues. 4. That Nature is our worst guide.

- 5. That onely Cowards dare dye.
 6. That the gifts of the body are better than those of the mind, or fortune.

That good is more comon then evill.

8. That by Discord things encrease. o. That it is possible to find some Vertue in some woman.

10. That old men ar more fantastique then young.

PROBLEMES.

- 1. Why are Courtiers Atheists sooner then men of other Conditions?
- 2. Why did Sr Walter Rawleigh write the History of these times? 3. Why doe Greate Men of all theyr dependants choose to preferre theyr Bawds?

4. Why doth not Gold soyle the fingers?

5. Why dye none for loue now?

- 6. Why doe young Laymen so much study Divinity?
- 7. Why hath the comon opinion affoorded woemen Soules?

8. Why are the fayrest falsest?

q. Why haue Bastards the best fortune?

10. Why doth Venus starre onely cast a Shadowe?

- 11. Why is Venus Starre multinominous both Hesper and Vesper?
- 12. Why is there more Variety of Greene then of other Colours?
- 13. Why doth the Poxe so much affect to vndermine the nose?
- 14. Why are new officers least oppressing? 15. Why doe Puritans make long Sermons?

16. Why are Statesmen most Incredible?

[Incredulous written first, ulous erased, and ible written above.]

17. Why doth Johannes Sarisburiensis writing de Nugis Curialium handle the providence and Omnipotency of God?

18. Why doe Woemen so much delight in feathers?

19. Why did the Deuill reserve Jesuits for these later times?

[CHARACTERS.]

Description of a Scot at first sight. Character of A Dunce.

Here the order both of paradoxes and of problems differs from that in the editions. The order of the paradoxes differs also from that in Wy., but the order of the problems is the same as in Wy. for Nos. 1-9, after which Wy. is defective.

The text of Problem 17 is as follows:

Why doth Johannes Sarisburiensis * writing de Nugis Curialium handle the providence and Omnipotency of God?

Though the Stoickes charge theyr Aduersaryes (who putt † free will, and make vs all wicked, (since nothing, naturally, denyes that we'h is ill,) to make our life a madnesse, And/They/charge the Stoickes who putting

I prouidence and necessity, doe yet admitt Lawes and rewardes, paynes and endeuours) that they make all but a iest and a toye : yet I thinke this Churchman did not so, because hee thought hee knewe how both those might consist together, because beeing of the family of Thomas of Becket § (who was a great Courtier), As hee put hunting and gaming and wantonnesse for the toyes of a Lay-Courtier: hee ment such meditations as those for the toyes of Clergy cortiers for the worthyest Mistery may bee annihilated, as the heavyest mettall may bee beate so thinne that you may blowe it away. But those times admitted no Iesting agaynst the church. And for the other Courtiers, hee could not taxe nor accuse them, that in theyr sportfull life they overreached to those high contemplacons, for they never thinke on them. Nor could hee reproche them by this, that all thinges web they doe are toyes, for they are seriously wicked. Eyther therefore hee ment to insinuate and conuey his doctrine by desguising it amongst toyes, of which (in thinges inclineable to good) hee thought them onely capable Or else hee put a tricke of Logike, wch is reason (and they are men of passion) vpon them, That by drawing them into a doubting and disputing of some particular Attributes of God, they might, before they were aware, implicitely confesse that there was

Here a word which looks like downe has been erased, and a cross has been made against putt. Put is used here and below in the obsolete sense of "affirm, assert" (see N.E.D.). The scribe probably wrote putt downe, and then saw that this was contrary to the meaning of the passage.

1 Here two words which appear to be downe and have been erased.

3 Here Donne alludes to John's close friendship with Becket, for whose sake

he suffered a long exile abroad. He dedicated the Policraticus to Becket.

The great work of John of Salisbury, Ioannis Saresberiensis Policraticus sive De Nugis Curialium et Vestigiis Philosophorum, deals with the principles of government, and with philosophical subjects, among the latter being the providence and omnipotence of God. In the first sentence of this problem Donne may be referring to the discussion of these questions in Book II., cap. xxi., especially the following passage (ed. C. C. J. Webb, vol. i. p. 119): "Vnde Stoicus omnia necessaria credit. timens euacuari posse scientiam immutabilem. E contra Epicurus eorum quæ eueniunt nichil prouidentiæ ratione dispositum, ne forte necessitatem mutabilibus rebus inducat, opinatur. Pari ergo errore desipiunt, cum alter casui alter necessitati uniuersa subiciat."

The tone of this problem, one of bitter satire of the Court and courtiers, is the same as finds expression in two of the 1652 Problemes -"Why are Courtiers sooner Atheists then men of other conditions?" and "Why are statesmen most incredulous?" Neither of these appeared in the first or second editions of 1632, probably because they might have offended the Court, and in O'F, the second of these immediately precedes this new problem. The first sentence is clumsily expressed, and by his erasures the scribe seems to have had some difficulty with it. The style however is clearly that of Donne's early prose. The inordinately long first sentence, with its parentheses and subordinate and co-ordinate clauses, reminds us of Donne's Character of a Dunce, which in the 1652 Paradoxes, Problemes consists of one immense sentence, occupying five pages. The concluding sentences of the problem should be compared with the end of Problem 16, which is similar in construction. The reference to the Stoics and the philosophers who opposed them reminds us of the reference in Paradox 10 (No. 7 in the editions) to the philosophers of the Sceptic and Academic schools, and in Paradox 2 (No. 10 in the editions) to the philosophers Heraclitus and Democritus.

More striking, however, than any array of parallel passages, is the likeness which this problem bears to the whole of Donne's prose work written between 1600 and 1608. The acquaintance with mediæval theology, the mixture of learning and cynicism, the gibes at the expense of courtiers—all these belong to the period when Donne, embittered first by the fall of Essex and then by his own banishment from Court, expressed his disappointment in letters or poems to his friends and in problems for his own amusement.

Moreover, the form of this problem corresponds closely with that of the other problems in the group—a form which, as far as we know, was peculiar to Donne. The other wits of the day, such as Sir William Cornwallis the younger, who published prose paradoxes to show their ingenuity, did not attempt these brief flights of sarcasm. Cornwallis' Essays on Certain Paradoxes (1616 and 1617) were longer and much more elaborate, containing ironical eulogies of debt and sadness, and a defence of Julian the Apostate and of Richard the Third. There was no other source with which we are acquainted from which the scribe could have drawn this extra material. The fact that the O'Flaherty manuscript contains some poems which are not by Donne need not cast any doubt on the genuineness of this problem. Donne's

poetical style was widely admired and was copied by a host of imitators. His prose paradoxes and problems enjoyed comparatively small popularity, and his style in them was copied by none. All the printed editions of his poems contain doubtful or spurious pieces, whereas the genuineness of his published Tuvenilia has never been disputed, and the connection between the editions and the manuscripts shows us the reason for this difference. The poems were widely circulated in manuscript, and a large number of spurious poems became attached to these collections, and so passed into the later editions of Donne's poems. The less popular prose trifles were circulated only in a few manuscripts, and there was no temptation to add to their number. Some of the paradoxes and problems were omitted in the first edition, probably because the licensing authorities objected to them. Most of these were added in the edition of 1652, but the collection was not complete, for the problem about Sir Walter Raleigh, which has the support of three manuscripts, was omitted, and the scribe of the Bodleian manuscript supplies a reason: "'Tis one of Dr. Donne's problems (but so bitter, vt his son lack Donne LL.D. thought not fitt to print it wth ye Rest)." This new problem may also have been omitted because of its bitterness against the Court, but a more likely explanation is to be found in its obscurity. Donne himself may have left it in an uncorrected state, feeling that its references to Johannes Sarisburiensis would not be understood by many of his friends, and that its attack on the triviality, wickedness, and atheism of courtiers was more forcibly carried out in his other problems.

The 1652 edition of the *Paradoxes*, *Problemes* has the following truncated version of Problem 18:—

Why do Women delight much in Feathers?

They think that Feathers imitate wings, and so shew their restlessness and instability. As they are in matter, so they would be in name, like *Embroiderers*, *Painters*, and such *Artificers* of curious *vanities*, which the vulgar call *Pluminaries*. Or else they have feathers upon the same reason, which moves them to love the unworthiest men, which is, that they may be thereby excusable in their inconstancy and often changing.

The O'Flaherty Manuscript expands this on pp. 436-7:

Why doe Woemen so much delight in feathers?

To say Similis Simili is too round, and it is obuious to every one. And it is besides the scope of my reason in my Problemes, wen extends onely

ad verisimile, not to expresse an vndenvable truth, as this reason is. It must bee confest that some men also loue feathers, but they are courtiers or souldiers, men (though perfectly contrary in theyr courses, vet) concurring in a desire of pursuing woemen, and assimilating themselues vnto them. Nor is there any thing so proper to woemen which is not sometimes intruded vpon by them, for princes vsurpe vpon falshood, Officers vpon Scraping, the Clergy vpon Brawlings, These de jure belong to woemen, who beeing comunicable creatures, and having no good, must comunicate theyr ill. Evther they thinke that feathers imitate winges, and shewe theyr restlesnesse and Instability Or by wearing of feathers they would haue a title to a roome in that verse, where Petrarch reckens vp to Boccace what thinges have bannished Vertue.

La Gola il somno et l'otiose piume.*

For Petrarch is no where so superfluous to repeate agayne that wch he had already sayd in this word somno. Nor could he have called the featherbeddes Idle beddes, for idle Beddes have not donne so much agaynst vertue as they, (for Gregory the 3^d grewe learned in his bedd). Therefore by feathers hee exp^{re}sseth some inseparable Companion of Woemen, or woemen themselves. Perchance as they are, in matter, they would bee also, in name, like Embroyderers, Paynters, and such Artificers of curious vanityes, weh Varro and the vulgar edition call Plumarios (for I dare not thinke them of so good conscience and humility that they confesse they deserue to bee Emplumados the punishmt weh the Spanish Iustice inflictes vpon looser woemen. Or else they loue feathers vpon the same reason weh makes them loue the vnworthyest men, weh is, that they may bee thereby excusable in theyr Inconstancy and often change. Or by this they have vtterly excluded themselves from entring into any definition of man. For as before they found Aristotles definition Animal rationale peremptory agaynst them: so now they have shutt vp that of Plato + or Pseusippus, I Animal bipes implume.

The new version of this problem has several points of interest. The printed text has one sentence, the meaning of which has hitherto been obscure: "Artificers of curious vanities, which the vulgar call Pluminaries." This suggests that pluminaries was a common word, whereas the N.E.D., finding no other instance of its use, doubtfully explains, "? A worker or dealer in feathers." The manuscript shows that Donne wrote plumarios, a word which, as he states, is found in Varro (apud Nonnium, 162, 27) and in the "vulgar edition," that is, the Vulgate text of Exodus, xxxv. 35. Donne alludes to the latter passage in his XXVI. Sermons (p. 1):

Petrarch, Sonetti e Canzoni, Son. vii. 1.
 † The saying is found in the "Definitions" of Plato, 415a.

Pseusippus is an error for Speusippus, the nephew and successor of Plato.

We have sometimes mention in Moses his book of Exodus, according to the Romane Translation, Operis Plumarii, of a kind of subtle and various workmanship, imployed upon the Tabernacle, for which it is hard to finde a proper word now; we translate it sometimes Embroidery, sometimes Needle-work, sometimes otherwise.

The references to Petrarch illustrate Donne's knowledge of Italian literature, which is evident in his poems and some of the early letters, but seldom finds expression in his prose works.

The bitterness of Donne's attitude towards women is shown much more clearly in the new version than in the printed text. The last sentence, with its denial to women of the gift of reason, is akin to Problem 7 (No. 6 in the editions), which suggests that women have no souls. In the printed text the problem has been cut down so much that the sting of Donne's cynicism is lost.

II

In the following section I have grouped together a number of passages in which the manuscripts throw light on a corrupt or obscure reading in the printed text. In section B. I quote a few passages in which an additional sentence is supplied by one or both of the manuscripts.

The passages from the printed text are taken from the first edition in which the particular paradox or problem appeared. As the first edition of 1633 has no pagination, I give references to the signatures. The Wyburd MS. having lost several leaves, the references are given to the headings of the paradoxes. The O'Flaherty MS. is paged.

A.

Juvenilia (1st edition, C19):

. . . And as *Imbroderers*, *Lapidaries*, and other *Artisans*, can by all things adorne their workes; for by adding better things, the better they shew in *Lush* and in *Eminency*; so *Good* doth not onely prostrate her *Amiablenesse* to all, but refuses no end, no not of her vtter contrary *Euill*, that she may bee the more *common* to vs.

Wyburd MS., "That good is more Comon then Euill":

And as Embroderers lapidaryes and other artizans can by all things adorne theire worke and by adding better things better theire shewe lustre and emminency Soe good doth not onely prostitute her owne amiablness to all, but refuseth noe end, noe not of her vtter contrarye euill: that she may bee more comon to vs. . . .

O'F., p. 412:

... And as Embroyderers, Lapidaryes, and other Artisans can by all thinges adorne theyr worke, for by adding better thinges they better the shewe and lustre and eminency: so good doth not onely prostrate her Amiablenesse to all, but refuses no end, no not of her other Contrary evill, that shee may bee more comon to vs.

Here Lush of the editions has caused difficulty, no other example of such an use of the word being known. The manuscripts make it clear that the word should be Lustre.

Juvenilia (1st edition, Sig. C4"):

Who reades this Paradoxe but thinks me more Fantastike now, than I was yesterday, when I did not thinke thus: And if one day make this sensible change in men, what will the burthen of many yeares?

Wyburd MS., "That old Men are more fantastique then Yonge":

Whoe reades this Paradox, but thinckes me more fantastique then I was yesterday, when I did not thinck thus? and if one day make this sensible change in mee, what will the burthen of manie yeares?

O'F., p. 416:

Who reades this Paradox will thinke mee more fantastique then I was yesterday when I did not thinke so, and if one day make this change in mee, what will the burden of many yeares!

Here the reading "in mee" is clearly to be preferred to the "in men" of the editions.

Juvenilia (1st edition, Sig. D2-3):

If by Nature we shall vnderstand our essence, our definition, or reason, noblenesse, then this being alike common to all (the Idiot and the wizard being equally reasonable) why should not all men having equally all one nature, follow one course? . . .

. . . Nature though oft chased away, it will returne; 'tis true, but those good motions and inspirations which bee our guides must be wooed, Courted, and welcomed, or else they abandon vs. And that old Axiome, nihil inuita, etc. must not be said thou shalt, but thou wilt doe nothing against Nature.

Wyburd MS., "That Nature is our worst guide":

If by nature wee shall vnderstand our essence, our difinition, our reasonableness, then this being alike comon to all; The Ideott and the wiseard being equally reasonable, why should not all men, haueing equally

all one nature followe one Cause? . . .

. . . Nature, though wee chase itt away will returne tis true, but those good motions and inspirations which are our guide, must bee wooed and courted and welcomed, or els they abandon vs, and that old, Tu nihil inuita etc must not bee sayd that thou shalt, but thou wilt doe noething against nature. . . .

O'F., pp. 406-7:

. . . If by nature wee shall vnderstand our essence, our Reasonablenesse,* our definition, then this beeing alike comon to all (the Idiot and the wizard beeing alike reasonable) why shall not all men hauing æqually

all one nature, follow one course?

. . . Nature, though wee chase it away, will returne agayne, tis true, But those good Motions and Inspirations wen ar our guides, must bee wooed and courted, and welcomed, or else they abandon vs. And that old Tu nihil invita dices faciesue Minerua must not bee ment that thou shalt, but thou wilt doe nothing agaynst Nature. . . .

Here the manuscripts make it clear that we should read "our reasonableness" instead of the meaningless "or reason, noblenesse" of the editions. In the second paragraph O'F. gives the full form of the quotation (Horace, Ars Poetica, 1. 385), which is abbreviated in the editions, and still further abbreviated in Wy.

Juvenilia (1st edition, Sig. G4!):

Why Venus-starre onely doth cast a shadow?

Is it because it is neerer the earth? But they whose profession it is to see that nothing be done in heaven without their consent (as Re—saies in himselfe of Astrologers) have bid Mercury to be neerer.

O'F., pp. 427-8:

Why doth Venus starre onely cast a Shadowe?

Is it because it is neerer the earth? But they whose Profession it is to see that nothing bee donne in heauen without theyr consent (as Ripler sayes in himselfe of all Astrologers) haue bidd Mercury to bee nearer.

Here Re— of the first edition, repeated in the two following editions, remained a puzzle. The problem is missing in Wy., but

^{*} The line division in the manuscript occurs in the middle of this word, so that it is written Reaso- | nablenesse.

O'F. by giving Ripler affords us a clue. The astronomer mentioned must be Kepler, since in *Ignatius his Conclaue* (1611 edition, p. 2), Donne mentions him thus:

Keppler, who (as himselfe testifies of himselfe) euer since Tycho Braches death, hath received it into his care, that no new thing should be done in heaven without his knowledge.

This is a reference to Kepler's words: "Tychone iam mortuo equidem have me cura incessit, ne quid fortasse novi existeret in cælo me inscio" (Kepleri Opera Omnia, ed. Frisch, ii. 762). The treatise from which the words were taken, De Stella tertii Honoris in Cygno, was published at Prague in 1606, so that this problem, like several others, must be later than the date usually assigned to the Juvenilia. Sir Edmund Gosse (Life and Letters of John Donne, ii. 301) dates them "before 1600," and Dr. G. L. Keynes (Bibliography of Donne, p. 49), says that they were "probably written before 1600." The evidence of Donne's letters, however, is in favour of a later date, about 1607, for some at least of the problems (Letters, 1651, pp. 88, 99, 108) and the problem about Raleigh's imprisonment and his History must be later than 1603, the date of Raleigh's trial, and may be as late as 1609 or 1610.*

Paradoxes, Problemes (1652), p. 61: Why are Courtiers sooner Atheists then men of other conditions?

Is it because as *Physitians* contemplating Nature, and finding many abstruse things subject to the search of Reason, thinks therfore that all is so; so they (seeing mens destinies, mad at Court, neck out and in joynt there, *War*, *Peace*, *Life* and *Death* derived from thence) climb no higher?

Wyburd MS.: "Why are Courtiers sooner Atheists, then Men of meaner Conditions?"

Is it because as Phisitians contemplateing nature and finding many obstruse things subject to the search of reason thinck therefore that all is soe; Soe they seeing Mens destinies made at Court, Necks putt out and ioynt there, Warrs, peace, life and death, deriude from thence, clyme noe higher?

O'F., p. 421: "Why are Courtiers Atheists sooner then men of other Conditions?"

^{*} The reference in the Problem to Raleigh as writing the "history of his own times" instead of the *History of the World* which he really undertook, shows that it belongs to the period before the publication of the book.

Is it because, as phisitians contemplating Nature and finding many abstruse things subject to the search of reason, thinke therefore that all is so: So they seeing mens destinyes made at Court, necks put out and in joynt there, warrs, peace, life, death derived from thence, climb no higher?

The second clause, unintelligible in the printed text, is clear in both MSS., though Wy. has omitted "in" before "ioynt."

B

Juvenilia (1st edition, Sig. B2-39):

. . . If her face be painted on a Boord or Wall, thou wilt loue it, and the Boord, and the Wall: Canst thou loath it then when it speakes, smiles, and kisses, because it is painted? Are wee not more delighted with seeing Birds, Fruites, and Beasts painted than wee are with naturalls? . . .

Wyburd MS.: "That women ought to painte themselues."

. . . Iff her face be painted on a board or wall thou wilt loue itt and the board and the wall: Canst thou loath itt then, when itt smyles speaks and kisses, because it is painted? Is not the Earths face, in the most pleasing season painted? Are wee not more delighted with seeing Birdes and fruits and Beasts painted, then wee are with naturalls. . . .

O'F., pp. 401-2:

. . . If her face bee paynted vpon a boord or a wall, thou wilt loue it and the board and the wall; canst thou lothe it when it speakes smiles and kisses because tis paynted? Are wee not more delighted with seeing Birds fruites and beastes paynted then with the naturalls! . . .

Juvenilia (1st edition, Sig. C4 ?):

... Necessity, which makes euen bad things good, preuailes also for them, for wee must say of them, as of some sharpe pinching Lawes; If men were free from infirmities, they were needlesse.

Wyburd MS.: "That it is possible to finde some virtue in some Women."

... Necessity which makes euen bad things good Preuailes alsoe for them, for wee must say of them as of some sharpe pinching lawes: if men were free from infirmityes, they were needless, but they are both good scourges for badd men.

O'F., p. 416:

. . . Necessity w^{ch} makes even badd thinges good, prevayles also for them, for wee may say of them as of some sharpe and pinching lawes, If

men were free from Infirmityes, they were needelesse, but they bee both good scourges for badd men.

Juvenilia (1st edition, Sig. G13):

. . . And for such as misse-demeane themselues a willow-greene; For Magistrates must aswell have Fasces borne before them to chastize the small offences, as Secures to cut off the great.

O'F., p. 430:

. . . And for such as Misdemeane themselves a willow greene. Or because shee would bee able to shewe and furnish *Greene* Merchantes, *Greene* Lawyers, *Greene* Captaynes, *Greene* Priuy Counsellors, and *Greene* Prelates properly.

This problem is missing in the Wyburd MS.

Juvenilia (1st edition, Sig. G4):

. . . But I thinke the true reason is, that being like Gold in many properties (as that all snatch at them, but the worst possesse them. . . .

Wyburd MS.: "Why are the fairest falsest?"

. . . But I thinck the true reasonn is, that being liker gould in many propertyes as that all snatch att them, that all Corruption is by them, that the worst possesse them. . . .

O'F., p. 426:

. . . But I thinke the true reason is, that beeing like Gold in many propertyes, (as that All snatch at them, That the worst possesse them. . . .

JAMES WHITE, ESQ. A FORGOTTEN HUMOURIST

By J. M. S. TOMPKINS

THE name of James White, poet, translator, historical novelist and pamphleteer, has been almost forgotten. The only modern references to him, I believe, are those of Professor Wilbur L. Cross: the citation of his name in the bibliographical note to the third chapter of The Development of the English Novel, and the synopsis of his second novel, The Adventures of John of Gaunt, contributed to Anglia (xxv. p. 251). Yet his novels, at least, have some interest for students of the late eighteenth century, for, at a time when the historical novel was a compound of ignorance and sensibility, they alone spring from the alliance of history with the comic spirit, and testify to their origin, not only by a flow of high spirits and cheerful satire, but by the passages of contemporary parody with which the romance is interspersed.

What information we have about James White is provided by an obituary notice in the European Magazine for April 1799,* and it is very scanty. He was a gentleman, claiming on his title-pages the "Esquire" that was still a badge of caste. He was probably an Irishman; at least he had close connections with Ireland. He was a scholar of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1788, and proceeded B.A. in 1780,† while his books contain ample witness of his interest in Irish history and Irish affairs. He took up literature as a profession, became fairly well known in the English literary world as a scholar and translator, and died, after a period of mental derangement, at Wick near Bath in March 1799. These are all the facts, but the obituary also yields suggestions of an interesting, freakish personality, and these suggestions are borne out by his books.

† v. Catalogue of Dublin Graduates.

[•] Reprinted in the Gentleman's Magazine (May 1799), the Annual Register (1799, vol. ii. p. 11), and with a short addition in the Monthly Magazine (May 1799).

Our chief business is with White's novels, but a certain interest is reflected from them upon his other experiments. We see there in separation the moods and themes of which the novels are a rather imperfect fusion. He began his literary career soberly with an annotated translation of Cicero's Orations against Verres, * published in 1787, and thereby testified both to the soundness of his education and to the master-enthusiasm of his life. The book was no mere exercise in scholarship. As he translated the attack on Verres he had in mind the preparations for the impeachment of another provincial governor-Warren Hastings; moreover, Cicero was the first of his orator-heroes. White belonged to an age of great orators; he had studied "the satirical energy of Grattan, the imperious logic of Flood, the grand and irresistible enthusiasm of Chatham," and to his solemn belief that liberty and justice are the main pillars of empire, he added a confidence in the power of splendid oratory to establish and preserve them both.

It is this two-edged eloquence (he wrote afterwards, in the Preface to his translation of Mirabeau's speeches), which kindles up the ardent and persevering spirit in great assemblies, elevates the public soul, leads to virtuous revolution and purifies political society. It is this which discomforts court-favourites, overthrows administrations, seats integrity at the council-table and gives capacity her due place.

Even in his novels he found occasion for a declaration of faith, and we have the picture of Longchamp, Grand Justiciary and Papal Legate, unmasked and discomfitted by the rhetoric of Lord Geoffrey Fitz-Peter.

Warren Hastings was not the only bugbear. There was the question of the slave-trade, on which a young man who identified himself with what was liberal in politics and literature could hardly keep silence. White's shilling pamphlet † is noticeable for its valiant assertion of moral principle and also for its style, which is firm and veined with scorn; and, as he adds the slight intensifying touch that burlesques his opponents' arguments, we get the first indication of the humourist who was to appear full-fledged in the last volume of his next book, Earl Strongbow.

Both books were well reviewed. Indeed, the only book of White's

^{*} The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero against Caius Cornelius Verres; translated with annotations; by James White, Esq. Cadell, 1787.

† Hints for a Specific Plan for an Abolition of the Slave-Trade and for Relief of the Negroes in the West Indies. By the translator of Cicero's Orations against Verres. London, printed for J. Debrett in Piccadilly, 1788.

to be received harshly was his poem on Conway Castle,* published in the same year as, and probably after, Earl Strongbow. It came before the public as a metrical innovation, and the Monthly Review + dismissed it with the remark: "Our disgust is excessive." It is, however, pleasant romantic stuff, slight but graceful, showing the influence of Gray and Collins in its attempt at a greater richness of vocabulary and a new pliancy and variety of verse. The poet meditates among ruins, indulging visions of their former splendour and the fanciful return of ghosts on moonlit nights; while in his deprecating Preface we trace the reaction of a solid mind that has

just made an experimental surrender to mere feeling.

It was therefore a man with a strong sense of the picturesque and an equally strong interest in contemporary affairs who made his début as a historical novelist in 1780 with the publication of Earl Strongbow: or, the History of Richard de Clare and the Beautiful Geralda. The growing popularity of the novel, reflected in the establishment of circulating libraries, offered an income to a young man of letters, and the standard of work was commonly so low that it was not difficult to excel. This was specially true of the historical novel which, since the publication of Sophia Lee's The Recess in 1783, had been coming rapidly into fashion. Disapproving reviewers, who feared lest the blend of history and fable should "poison the sources of information for young readers," & deplored the tendency and described it as a revival of the outworn fashion of the French heroic romance; but the novel of the 'eighties was something far cruder than the Grand Cyrus. The productions of Sophia Lee, Anne Fuller, and the other forgotten and mostly nameless authors, whose books were so firmly dealt with by the candid reviewers of the Monthly and the Critical, belong to the Gothic family. They are all cut upon the pattern of Longsword, Earl of Salisbury, and combine a few irrelevant pages of fact, transcribed from some text-book, with a great deal of melodrama. "I mean not to offend the majesty of sacred truth," wrote Anne Fuller in Alan Fitz-Osborne, an historical tale (1787), "by giving her but a secondary

[•] Conway Castle; a poem. To which are added Verses to the memory of the Late Lord Chatham; and the Moon, a simile for the fashionable world; by James White, Esq. Printed for J. Dodsley, 1789.

September 1789. Published anonymously. In two volumes. Printed for J. Dodsley, Pall Mall, 1789. § Monthly Review, May 1789.

place in the following pages. Necessity, stronger than prudence, obliges me to give fiction the pre-eminence; but . . . I have preserved her genuine purity as unblemished as circumstances would admit." She might well feel apologetic; circumstances had admitted a little disconnected information about the Barons' War, but by far the greater part of the historical tale is devoted to such attractions as the bleeding spectre of Matilda, who, appearing at her murderer's bedside during a thunderstorm, first tears the coverlet from his grasp, and then, drawing a dagger from her heart, lets her life-blood drip upon him from the point.

Into this vulgar and violent world Earl Strongbow was launched. It begins in the orthodox way with a ruined castle and an ancient manuscript. The manuscript narrates how a prisoner in Chepstow Castle in the reign of Charles II. met on the battlements the ghost of Richard de Clare, former lord of Chepstow and conqueror of Ireland, who, more urbane than most of his Gothic fraternity, repeated to him in eighteen nocturnal interviews the story of his life. The tone of the prisoner's story veers erratically between romance and fun, for Strongbow is no conventional spectre.

But permit me, continued I, to ask your Lordship why you do not speak in that hollow tone, in which it is said the spirits of departed persons are accustomed to address the living?

Be assured, replied the noble vision, that it is mere affectation, and intended to give an air of consequence to what they say.

During the first part of the book, however, which deals with the youth of Strongbow, his virtuous love for Geralda and his adventures as knight-errant, the romantic tone predominates, though it is a far more restrained romance than the hectic effusions of contemporaries. The elegant formality of the courtship—the Critical Review called it "weak and inefficient" —is a far-off reflection of the heroic romance, while behind the fighting looms the shadow of Virgil, not unaccompanied by that of Ossian. It is a romance, moreover, that turns to the past as to an object worth study in itself, not only as a source of self-indulgent reverie. White's antiquarianism is perhaps not profound, but he has read widely and his imagination has been touched. He was, said the Critical Review, "well acquainted with ancient manners, and minutely attentive to every part of the costume," * and though such emphatic praise is compre-

hensible only in an age when twelfth-century soldiers were represented discharging pistols,* yet White certainly had a degree of historical knowledge unusual in an eighteenth-century novelist. He reels off the names of proud and ancient families in Ireland and England—de Brokes, de Spencers, Fitzherberts, "the O'Brien of Limerick, the O'Carrol of Uriel, the MacLaughlin of Ophaly," and writes enthusiastically of the Earl of Shrewsbury's household, the school of chivalry in which Strongbow was educated in martial and moral discipline. In the hands of Earl Strongbow, moreover, the chivalric ideal becomes a stick to be laid across the backs of his descendants.

We handled the battle-ax (he declares), you wield the dice-box. We ran at the ring, you play at ombre. Our breakfast was beef and ale, yours is toast and chocolate. . . . We were a stately and robust race, you are an enervated and unmajestic generation.

Four years later, in Clara Reeve's Roger de Clarendon, the ungracious vein is worked in all seriousness.

A minstrel, who sings the mighty deeds of King Arthur,† betrays the source at which White nourished his enthusiasm for chivalry. It was a source which few of his contemporaries approached or knew how to relish when they accidentally stumbled upon it. The episode of the dark glen and the lighted castle, with all its flaws of taste and handling and its Radcliffian anti-climax, is the work of a man who has heard the note of mysterious beauty in Arthurian romance and can in his turn touch even if he does not care to hold it.

With Strongbow's arrival in Ireland, White emerges from his romantic mood, and the parodist supersedes the poet. The debate on the siege of Wexford brings him within touch of his chief interest, Parliamentary oratory, and we begin to detect beneath the helmets of Strongbow's barons the features of the faithful commons of George III. There is that "able knight" Fitzstephen (Fox), denoted by "the tendency of his hue to brownness, and an extensive pair of very sable eyebrows"; there is William Fitz-Aldhelm (Pitt), "a young man of a stiff neck and great probity," who "could make orations in a clear, correct, elevated and embellished style, and with a prodigality of language, a good portion of which might with safety have been spared"; and there is Redmond Cantimere

* The Fatal Vow, by F. Lathom, 1807, vol. i. p. 310.
† There are references to Amadis of Gaul and Bevis of Southampton (vol. i. p. 96), and to Archbishop Turpin and Geoffrey of Monmouth (vol. ii. p. 98).

(Sheridan), a composer of moralities, brandishing his forky tongue in comment on the purple eloquence of Sir Theodore Fitzhenry (Burke?). Sir Theodore's speech had ended in an impassioned apostrophe to the Queen of Heaven and the ancestors of the Normans; Cantimere rises to reply.

In the little that he said (for contrary to his custom he was but five minutes upon his legs) he took notice with a mild air and placid visage, and having his helmet under his arm, of the gallant piety with which a noble knight, then in his eye, had invoked our lady, the Virgin, and of the judicious mixture of devotion and declamation into which his speech had expanded at the conclusion, where Logic, that close and reserved nymph, had condescended to soften the harshness of her features, had brightened into ornament, and, like the setting sun in a fair evening after a scowling day, spread a pleasing and animating glow upon the horizon. Sir Redmond did not see why the ghosts of our fore-fathers, who had fought at the battle of Hastings, might not as well stand by us and see fair play beneath the ramparts of Dublin as under the walls of Wexford; and he made no doubt that (considering the fine compliment the noble knight had paid them), they would be equally happy to serve us in any other part of the island.

Wexford is taken, and the invaders move forward to encounter the leagued forces of the Irish princes. On the night before the battle, while the English forces snuff the reek of whisky blown from the Irish camp, two young knights, mindful of their Virgil, disguise themselves and go out into the enemy's lines as scouts. "They had even swallowed a minute portion of the liquor already mentioned, that, their breath savouring of it, they might the better avoid suspicion." Their ruse is successful; the English lion, as Strongbow puts it, tears the harp of Hibernia, and in course of time Strongbow becomes what we need not hesitate to call Lord Lieutenant. It is now possible to recognise him too. His refusal to resort to the bribery of his foes, his war against jobbery and monopoly-" By God's blessing I made them honest in spite of their teeth," declares the ghost, a remark his editor has thrown into a note, "it being somewhat less dignified than the rest of his speech" -identify Strongbow with Lord Temple, who, during his first viceroyalty (1782-3) and again when Earl Strongbow was published, had instituted enquiries into petty fraud among the minor officials of State.*

By this time the book has swung far out of its original course and

e v. Lecky, History of Ireland (vol. ii. p. 349).

does not answer to the helm very well when it has to be steered once more for the coast of romance. The beautiful Geralda is perfunctorily drowned in the Wye on her wedding-day and buried at Tintern; and here, with one of White's curious touches of seriousness—for he can never speak of death or providence otherwise than solemnly—the story ends. It was an incongruous ending for the first book that broke through the tradition of gloom hitherto maintained by historical novelists. To them what was past was melancholy, and, like the picturesque artists of the day, they saw their subject in perspective through a ruined arch, while rusted swords and defaced tombs lay scattered in the foreground. From this sentimental fallacy James White was freed by his temperament and his studies. Under the ribs of death he created lungs capacious enough for hearty gusts of laughter-an unexampled levity, hardly paralleled until Sir Walter Scott established the historical novel as a branch of humane letters.

How uncertain its position then was in the eyes of the critics can be illustrated from the notices of Earl Strongbow in the Monthly and Critical Reviews. To the Monthly * reviewer a novel can only be justified if it is didactic, and he sees in the blending of history and invention a grievous perversion of doctrine. It is the old confusion between ideal truth and actual fact; the bonds that the Puritan distrust of "fable" had sought to put upon creative imagination still lay, like tangled snares, about the feet of the young novel. The Critical, t on the other hand, is plainly interested in the problem of the historical romance and prepared to see history supplemented by fiction, provided the facts themselves are not tampered with. It is pleasant to watch the austere Monthly unbending over White's later books. The reviewer could not pass over the reckless anachronisms in John of Gaunt, t or the passage in which the highborn Duke of Lancaster is permitted to refer to another character as "a snotty-looking Baron," but, after comparing White to his disadvantage with Gay, Le Sage, Sterne, Tom Brown, Cervantes

August 1790.

[†] May 1789.

† The Adventures of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, by James White, Esq., Author of Earl Strongbow, Conway Castle, etc., 3 vols. Crowder, 1790. There is no copy in the British Museum, but the Monthly Review (August 1790) printed a long extract and there is Prof. Wilbur Cross's synopsis in Anglia (xxv.). It is impossible to tell from these what contemporary parody the book may contain, but White was dealing with four young Royal Princes, and it is unlikely that he missed his chance.

and Swift, he admits that the book can be read. Over Cœur-de-Lion* he fairly capitulates. Mr. White, he observed, was proceeding in "his heterogeneous plan of combining History with Romance, Chivalry and burlesque Ridicule, by which last ingredient the Dignity of Heroism [was] oddly caricatured," but "his abilities, though of a very singular cast, were capable of forcing even the most serious, critical, fastidious reader to some degree of approbation"; for himself, he had read Cœur-de-Lion, shaking his sides and his head at the same time.†

Earl Strongbow established the nature of White's contribution to the historical novel. In the two later books he combines his materials more harmoniously, strengthening the humour and lightening the romance. The substance of his charming Cœur-de-Lion is farce, shot at intervals with faintly glinting threads of beauty. He does not, however, much vary his plan, and his theme remained the ancient and popular one of the wandering knight, which had received new sanction from the inverted romance of the picaresque novel, and was now handled by him in a way that kept in mind both its origin and its adoption.

In his light-hearted preface to Cœur-de-Lion White declared that his object in writing was " to explore the remote doings of antiquity, to show life as life was, in those heroic days, and evince that our forefathers were as foolish as we are ourselves." Consequently in this book comedy predominates over both history and romance, and the hero, returning incognito from his Styrian prison, approaches England through a gallery of modern follies in mediæval dress. They are depicted with lively comic force and in the sweetest of tempers. There is the Lady Ursulina, "grandest and most dismal of widowed women," who distributes broth to the poor in black porringers and reproves the King for his "vehement inclination to swearing"; there is the Lady Abbess of Heidelberg, whose reminiscences include the whole art of husband-hunting as practised at that mediæval Bath, Aix-la-Chapelle; and there is the more individualised figure of the princely and tolerant Bishop of Bamberg, flippant in society to the verge of scandal, but a strict reformer of order in his bishopric, a benevolent patron and a connoisseur of art, whose music-meetings on Sunday nights are the talk of the country.

^{*} The adventures of King Richard Cœur-de-Lion, 3 vols., by James White, Esq. 1791, Evans.

[†] August 1790.

To the King he says disarmingly, "I love a little luxury, I vow to God." * Moreover, the King's most romantic adventure suffers a rationalistic twist. With all the proper accompaniments of magic liquor, monstrous beasts and caitiff lord, he rescues the Duke of Saxony's daughter from the rock-built tower on the Elbe, where she has been immured for eighteen years, only to find that the unparalleled maiden, instead of tarrying awhile "in the rational expectation of being rescued," has admitted the caitiff lord to her affections long ago. The conventional King insists on delivering her and swings her up behind him on his horse, but all the way home she sticks pins into him through the joints in his armour.

Cœur-de-Lion was White's last novel; the writing of it must have been pure pastime; yet towards the end, under the fun, there is a note of meaning. The burlesque impeachment of Longchamp could not fail to recall the great contemporary trial of Warren Hastings, and it ends, as White wished the real trial to end, with the disgrace of the accused. His next books were exclusively concerned

with contemporary affairs.

During 1792 appeared his translations of two volumes of Mirabeau's speeches † and of St. Etienne's history of the French Revolution.† Both books are informed by a sober enthusiasm for the Revolution, while in Mirabeau he recognised once more his ideal figure, the orator-statesman, harnessing the emotions of his hearers to the service of reason and patriotism. Both books are full of healthy vigour; we take leave of James White with the language of enthusiasm on his lips and plans for the translation of Fénélon's Education des Filles, and perhaps of the New Arabian Tales, § maturing in his brain. The next record of him is contained in the European Magazine for April 1799.

Pension), had been dead eight years when Cœur-de-Lion was published.

† Speeches by M. de Mirabeau, the Elder, pronounced in the National Assembly of France. To which is prefixed a sketch of his life and character. Translated from the French edition of M. Méjan, by James White, Esq. Debrett, 1792. The British Museum only possesses the first volume; the second was published separately and reviewed in August by the Critical Review.

† The History of the Resolution in France. Translated from the French of P. P.

† The History of the Revolution in France. Translated from the French of J. P. Rabaut, Member of the National Convention. By James White, Esq. Debrett. 1792. The British Museum copy is of the second edition of 1793.

§ Critical Review, August 1792.

[·] He recalls Cowper's Occiduus (v. Letter to Rev. John Newton, September 9, 1781, and The Progress of Error (ll. 124-7); he is certainly not Charles Wesley, however, who is suggested as the original of Occiduus in Wright's edition. Archbishop Cornwallis, an otherwise possible identification (v. Peter Pindar in Peter's

In the course of the last month was found dead in his bed at the Carpenter's Arms, a public house in the parish of Wick, Gloucestershire, about 6 miles from Bath, James White, Esq., a gentleman well-known in the literary world.

The obituary notice follows. He was known, we are told, as an admirable scholar, but for four or five years his conduct had been "marked by great wildness and eccentricity." A disappointment in love was followed by the failure of an application for patronage which he had made, and he began to fancy himself surrounded by "plotters and contrivers," bent on frustrating all his future prospects in life. One suspects an additional cause in the appalled disillusionment of a sanguine spirit over the trend of the revolution in France.

The winters of 1797 and 1798 he passed in the neighbourhood of Bath; and many of our readers may often have noticed in the pumproom, the streets or the vicinity of the city, a thin, pale, emaciated man (between thirty and forty) with a wild yet penetrating look, dressed in a light coat of Bath coating. His means of subsistence were very scanty; and he obliged the cravings of nature to keep within their limits. He has been known to have debarred himself of animal food for months, and to have given life a bare subsistence by a biscuit, a piece of bread, or a cold potatoe and a glass of water. Unable to pay his lodgings and too proud to ask relief, he would many nights wander about the fields, or seek repose beneath a hay-stack, almost exhausted. He once took refuge in an inn in Bath, where his extraordinary conduct, and his refusing every sustenance alarmed the mistress and impelled her to apply to the magistrates, who humanely ordered him to be put under the care of the parishofficer. Instead of appreciating these precautionary means as he ought to have done, he in letters to some persons in the city, complained of "the undue interference of magisterial authority, and the unconstitutional infringement of the liberty of the subject."

-an action by which, as his former critic might have observed, he once more "oddly caricatured the Dignity of Heroism."

He remained keenly interested in politics. We hear of certain Letters to Lord Camden on the State of Ireland,* written in one of the intervals when his mind was more composed, and much admired for "the elegance and strength of his language, the shrewdness of his remarks, and the perspicuity of his arguments." At last a small

^{*} I have so far been unable to trace these Letters. The obituary states that they were published, but gives no details. They do not seem to be mentioned in the lists of pamphlets on Ireland reviewed in contemporary magazines. The D.N.B. dates them 1798, and Watt's Bibliotheca Britamica mentions Letters to the Earl of Camden (1798), but ascribes them to Arthur O'Connor.

subscription was raised for his relief, and he was with difficulty prevailed on to accept it. With these few pounds in his pocket he retreated to Wick, where presently he took to his bed, and, refusing all food, died after two days. A coroner's inquest was called, and its finding may be reflected in the entry in the Register of the Church of St. James, Abson, which I owe to the courtesy of the Reverend Rupert E. Lewis.

1799, James White, Esq.: (he ended his existence by Famine—supposed to be insane) his name not learnt for sometime. March 15th.

He had enjoyed some measure of fame both at home and abroad; his jolly piping was heard even in that noisy time, and half-reluctant critics danced to it. His books were the pastime of a scholar and a wit, and are worth reading, not only as documents in the history of the novel, but for their urbane satire, their sensitiveness to beauty and their boyish shouts of mirth. He is an obscure but not a negligible link in that characteristically English line of writers who have known how to combine beauty and burlesque and have disciplined their enthusiasms with laughter. Strongbow and Cœur-de-Lion do stand, however humbly, in the same tradition as A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Princess.

[•] There were German translations of Strongbow (1790) and John of Gaunt (1791), and the Allgemeine Literaturzeitung records White's death (Intelligenzblatt für 1800, S. 660). Strongbow was put into French (1789).

WORDSWORTH AND THE SPECTATOR

By T. E. CASSON

It is familiar knowledge that Wordsworth in one of his sonnets has acknowledged an obligation to the *Spectator*. This is the sonnet beginning "The fairest, brightest hues of ether fade" (*Misc. Sonn.* I. viii.); and the acknowledgment is to the "Vision of Mirza." It may be of interest, therefore, to determine to what extent Wordsworth "gave his days and nights to Addison."

If we pass by Addison's papers on the Ballad of the Children in the Wood and on the Pleasures of the Imagination, which are familiar to students of Wordsworth's theory and practice, the remaining references may be divided into (I.) possible obligations of Wordsworth to the subject-matter of the Spectator; (II.) verbal parallels between the Spectator and Wordsworth.

I. (1) First of similarities of subject may be mentioned *Memorials* of a Tour in Italy, 1837, xxiv.; In Lombardy. With Wordsworth's contrast of the old man and the silk-worm—the old man ascending

To bliss unbounded, glory without end,

compare the Spectator, No. 111:

The silk-worm, after having spun her task, lays her eggs and dies. But a man can never have taken in his full measure of knowledge, has not time to subdue his passions, establish his soul in virtue, and come up to the perfection of his nature, before he is hurried off the stage. Would an infinitely wise Being make such glorious creatures for so mean a purpose?

(2) With regard to the colour green. Wordsworth has the line:

Not melancholy-no, for it is green (Excursion, ii. 355).

With this compare the Spectator, No. 387:

There are writers of great distinction, who have made it an argument for Providence, that the whole earth is covered with green rather than with any other colour, as being such a right mixture of light and shade, that it comforts and strengthens the eye, instead of weakening or grieving it . . . the poets ascribe to this particular colour the epithet of cheerful.

(3) In the Spectator, No. 415, may be found a description of the wall of China anticipatory of two lines of Wordsworth. Addison writes:

The wall of China is one of these Eastern pieces of magnificence, which makes a figure even in the map of the world, although an account of it would have been thought fabulous, were not the wall itself extant.

In the Prelude, book viii., occur the lines (ll. 79-80):

Beyond that mighty wall, not fabulous, China's stupendous mound.

(4) Wordsworth at Cambridge seems to have belonged to what the Spectator terms the "sect of philosophers . . . called loungers." With his reference to the Castle of Indolence,

> To time thus spent, add multitudes of hours Pilfered away, by what the Bard who sang Of the Enchanter Indolence hath called "Good-natured lounging," and behold a map Of my collegiate life (*Prelude*, vi. 179–183).

compare the Spectator, 54:

The following letter being the first that I have received from the learned University of Cambridge, I could not but do myself the honour of

publishing it.

"... Believing you to be an universal encourager of liberal arts and sciences, ... I thought an account of a sect of philosophers, very frequent among us, but not taken notice of, as far as I can remember, by any writers, either ancient or modern, would not be unacceptable to you. The philosophers of this sect are in the language of our university called loungers."

And in No. 78 of the Spectator the essayist—Steele—remarks that "the Loungers are of the same standing with the university itself."

(5) To every form of being is assigned An active principle (Excursion, ix. 1, 3).

> Along his infant veins are interfused The gravitation and the filial bond Of nature that connect him with the world (*Prelude*, ii. 242-4).

This principle Addison explains by reference to the principle of gravitation acting in the animal world ("by instinct, and without the least glimmering of thought or common sense"). He takes as his example the hen, who is "a very idiot," and goes on:

There is not, in my opinion, anything more mysterious in nature than this instinct in animals, which thus rises above reason, and falls infinitely short of it. It cannot be accounted for by any properties in matter, and at the same time works after so odd a manner, that one cannot think it the faculty of an intellectual being. For my own part, I look upon it as upon the principle of gravitation in bodies, which is not to be explained by any known qualities inherent in the bodies themselves, nor from the laws of mechanism, but, according to the best notions of the greatest philosophers, is an immediate impression from the first mover, and the divine energy acting in the creatures (Spectator, 120).

Cf. also Spectator, 571:

Every particle of matter is actuated by this Almighty Being which passes through it. The heavens and the earth, the stars and planets, move and gravitate by virtue of this great principle within them.

So for the comparison with "links" of a chain (Excurs. ix. 14-15), "from link to link it circulates, the Soul of all the worlds" (cf. Poems ded. to Indep. and Liberty, Pt. II., xlvi. 189, "Links in the chain of Thy tranquillity") vide Spectator, 519:

In this system of being, there is no creature so wonderful in its nature, and which so much deserves our particular attention, as man, who fills up the middle space between the animal and intellectual nature, the visible and invisible world, and is that link in the chain of beings which has been often termed the nexus utriusque mundi. So that he, who in one respect, being associated with angels and archangels, may look upon a Being "of infinite perfection" as his father, and the highest order of spirits as his brethren, may in another respect say to "corruption, Thou art my father; and to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister."

Compare also Prelude, viii. 485-494:

In the midst stood Man,
Outwardly, inwardly contemplated,
As, of all visible natures, crown, though born
Of dust, and kindred to the worm; a Being,
Both in perception and discernment, first
In every capability of rapture,
Through the divine effect of power and love;
As, more than anything we know, instinct
With godhead, and, by reason and by will,
Acknowledging dependency sublime.

The Biblical reference, in each instance, is to Job xvii. 14.

II. Verbal parallels.

(1) "Under-agent" (Prelude, xiii. 273):

Words are but under-agents in their souls.

Spectator, 225: "Discretion . . . is like an under-agent of Providence."

(2) " Labouring " (Excursion, vii. 1. 409) :

Murmured the labouring bee.

Spectator, 482:

As from the sweetest flowers the lab'ring bee Extracts her precious sweets" (CREECH).

(For Lucr. iii. 11: Floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant.)

(3) "Voice" (To the Cuckoo, Il. 3-4):

O Cuckoo! shall I call thee Bird, Or but a wandering Voice?

Spectator, 61:

In short, one may say of a pun, as the countryman described his nightingale, that it is "vox et præterea nihil"—" a sound, and nothing but a sound."

(4) "Phantom" (Poems of the Imagination, viii. 1):

She was a Phantom of delight.

Spectator, 503:

The truth is, ber beauty had something so innocent, and yet so sublime, that we all gazed upon her like a *phantom*. . . . She has been talked of among us ever since, under the name of " the *phantom*."

(5) "Obolus" (Prelude, iii. 473-4):

An obolus, a penny give To a poor scholar!

Spectator, 461:

I do not know but you might bring in the Date Obolum Belisario with a good grace.

(6) "Now" (Poems of Sentiment and Reflection, xxxv., The Warning, 1. 90):

Past, future, shrinking up beneath the incumbent Now.

Spectator, 590:

To which the ingenious Mr. Cowley alludes in his description of heaven:

Nothing is there to come, and nothing past, But an eternal now does always last. (7) "Progenitors" (used of birds) (Misc. Sonn. III. vi. 13-14):

Listening, and listening long, in rapturous mood, Ye heavenly Birds I to your Progenitors.

Spectator, 412: of Merula and Philomela.

castos confessa parentes.
Speak the chaste loves of their progenitors—

(8) Finally, with the title of Wordsworth's philosophic ode compare Spectator, 635:

Is not this more than an intimation of our immortality?

The word "intimation" occurs earlier, in Spectator, 487:

... Strong intimations, not only of the excellency of the human soul, but of its independence on the body.

Again, to lines 66-7 of the Ode:

Shades of the prison-house begin to close Upon the growing Boy,

may be adduced this parallel from Dr. Sherlock, quoted in the Spectator, No. 513:

And methinks this is enough to cure us of our fondness for these bodies, unless we think it more desirable to be confined to a prison, and to look through a grate all our lives, which gives us but a very narrow prospect, and that none of the best neither, than to be set at liberty to view all the glories of the world.

SAMUEL DANIEL AND THE CHILDREN OF THE QUEEN'S REVELS, 1604-5

By R. E. BRETTLE

DANIEL'S connexion with the Children of the Oueen's Revels has been known from the mention of him as licenser of their plays, so appointed by the Queen's pleasure, in the Patent granted to Edward Kirkham, Thomas Kendall, Alexander Hawkins, and Robert Payne on February 4, 1604.* Later, on January 1 and 3, 1605, Daniel is mentioned with Henry Evans in the declared accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber as payee for plays at Court by the Revels Children. + Sir Edmund Chambers has pointed out that Daniel's indiscretion over his play Philotas, produced almost certainly by the Revels Children in or about autumn 1604, was not such as to prevent his acting as payee for the Children at Court in the following January; 1 and, further, has suggested that Daniel's connexion with the boys' company—evidently more active than censorship of their plays-only ceased when the Eastward Ho affair of 1605 led to the withdrawal of Queen Anne's patronage.

The following copy of two documents, brought to light in a search for more information on Marston's relations with the same boys' company, adds other details. It shows that Daniel went to

[•] See Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, ii. 49-51; and Malone Soc. Coll., part iii. 267

[†] Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, loc. cit.; and Mod. Lang. Review, iv. 153

et seq.

1 Elizabethan Stage, iii. 274-6. Philotas was entered on the Stationers' Register, November 29, 1604.

¹ [Since Mr. Brettle's article was put into type, copies have been received in England of a book by Prof. Harold N. Hillebrand on The Child Actors (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature), in an appendix to which these documents are printed. It appears to be a case of independent discovery by two scholars working at the same subject. We have, however, thought it best to print the article as written, as the documents are of interest, and Prof. Hillebrand's publication is not easily accessible in England.—Ed. R. E. S.]

great trouble and expense, according to his own account, in order to obtain the 1604 Patent for Kirkham and the rest; that in return Kirkham and the others on April 28, 1604 became bound in a bond of £100 for a yearly payment to Daniel of £10; that in spite of speech between Daniel and Kirkham on October 25, 1604, for a different system of payment, Daniel enjoyed the original annuity for just one year, after which, on April 28, 1605, the bond and annuity were made over to John Gerrard, and afterwards Daniel "neaver intermedled or had to doe" with Kirkham and his partners or the Patent.

It may be that Daniel's trouble over *Philotas* led to the "speech of communication" of October 25, 1604, or inclined him to think of severing his connexion with the company as soon as convenient. Or it may be, as Chambers suggests, that trouble over *Eastward Ho* and the withdrawal of the Queen's patronage led Daniel to discontinue his association with Kirkham and the others. In this latter case the production of *Eastward Ho* must have been earlier than April 28, 1605, as it might have been, for the play may have been staged at any time between the production of Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho*—dated, from allusions, late in 1604 and mentioned in the Prologue to *Eastward Ho*—and September 4, 1605, the date of the entry of *Eastward Ho* in the Stationers' Register.*

It would appear also from the documents that Kirkham for some time before May 9, 1609, had discontinued the payment of the annuity to Daniel's assignee, John Gerrard, who just before that date had sued—using Daniel's name—in the Court of the King's Bench for the forfeiture of the bond. Kirkham thereupon, joining with Anne Kendall, the widow of his former partner (more it would seem in an attempt to arouse sympathy than because of legal necessity), lodged his more or less romancing Bill of Complaint in the Court of Chancery. Only Daniel's answer is found preserved with Kirkham's complaint, but in itself seems a sufficient reply to end proceedings.

It is reasonable to suggest that Kirkham ceased his yearly or quarterly or other payments to Gerrard when he severed his connection with the Children of the Queen's Revels, or the Children of the Revels as they were known, 1605–6, and the Children of Blackfriars 1606–9. In the spring of 1606 Kirkham appears in the Treasurer of the Chamber's Accounts as "one of the Masters of the

^{*} See Elizabethan Stage, iii. 433-4.

Children of Pawles," and it is very likely, as Chambers suggests, that about February 1606, after Day's Isle of Gulls had given some new offence to the authorities, Kirkham discreetly retired from any active part in the business of the Revels Children at Blackfriars, although he continued to be concerned therein for the following two years, until the more or less complete break-up of the company in March 1608. Very probably, then, Gerrard received no benefit from his purchase of Daniel's annuity after March 1608, and his suit in the Court of the King's Bench for the forfeiture of the bond, followed by Kirkham's complaint in Chancery, is apparently the first of a long line of lawsuits consequent on the break-up of the Blackfriars boys' company, with the attendant surrender to Richard Burbage before August 9, 1608, of Evans's lease of the Blackfriars theatre.

COPIES † OF A BILL OF COMPLAINT AND THE ANSWER THERETO IN THE COURT OF CHANCERY PRESERVED AT THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

CHANCERY PROCEEDINGS. SERIES I. BUNDLE K4. No. 33.

(The Bill of Complaint and the Answer are both dated in a handwriting different from that filling the rest of the skins.)

Ι

(The Bill of Complaint of Edward Kirkham and Anne Kendall.) Nono die Maij 1609.

To the Right honorable Thomas Lord Elsemeare, Lord Chauncelor of England.

In most humble wise Complayninge sheweth vnto your good Lordship your dayly Orator Edward Kyrkham of the Strand in the County of Middlesex gentleman, and Anne Kendall Widowe Executrix of the last will and Testament of her late Husband Thomas Kendall Cityzen and Haberdasher of London deceased That whereas our Sovereigne Lord the Kinges Majesty [" that now is "—interlined] by His Lettres Patente bearinge date at Westminster the Fourth day of February in the First yeare of His Majesty's Reighne of England Fraunce and Ireland, and of Scotland the Seaven and Thirteth did authorise and appointe the foresaid Edward Kirckham and Thomas Kendall with Allexander Hawkins and

· Elizabethan Stage, ii. 52.

[†] Italicised letters indicate expansions of handwriting abbreviations.

Roberte Payne from tyme to tyme to provide and bringe vpp a convenyente number of Children and them to Exercise and practise in the qualitie of playinge by the name of the Children of the Revells to the Queene Whin the BlackeFryers in the Citty of London, or within any other Convenyent place where they shoulde thinke fitt for that purpose: Provided that noe such playes or shewes shoulde be presented before the Queene or by them anywhere publiquely Acted but by the Approbacon and Allowance of Samuell Danyell as by the said Lettres Patente more at large appearethe. And whereas afterwardes aboute the Twenteth Eighte Day of Aprill then nexte followinge in Regard of the paines to be taken by the said Samuell Danyell aboute the Approbacon and Allowance of such Playes and shewes as shoulde be Acted and presented by the said Children as aforesaid the said Edward Kyrkham and Thomas Kendall by one Obligacon or writeinge obligatorie beareinge date the [" said "-interlined.] Twentie Eighth day of Aprill in the second yeare of his Majesty's ['Reigne "-interlined] became bound vnto the said Samuell Danyell in the some of One Hundred pounder of Lawfull Englishe Monie with Condicon thereon Indorsed for the true payment vnto the said Danyell everie yeare that the said Edward Kyrkham, Thomas Kendall, Allexander Hawkins and Robert Payne shoulde by vertue of His Majesty's lettres patente aforesaid keepe and maintayne any children accordinge to the tenor of the said lettres patente one Annuity or yearely Some of Tenne poundes of lawfull mony of England at the feastes of St. John Baptiste, St. Michaell Tharchangell, the birth of our Lord god, and the Annunciacon of the blessed Lady St. Marie the Virgine, or within Tenne dayes nexte after euery of the same Feastes by even porcons, yf the said Children shoulde play, or make any shewes eyther publiquely or privately the full tyme of Sixe Moneths in euerie yeare: And yf the said Children should not play or make any shewes the full tyme of Sixe moneths in eny yeare by reason of any prohibicon or pestilence in the Citty of London that then the said Kyrkham and Kendall should paye vnto the said Danyell after the Rate of Sixteene shillinges and Eighte pence a moneth for such longer or shorter tyme as the said Children shoulde presente, ["themselves"—deleted] or doe any playes or shewes eyther publiquely or privately as aforesaid beinge not the full tyme of sixe moneths in one yeare as by the said Obligacon and Condicon thereppon Indorsed more at large yt doth and may appeare: After which bond soe made the said Danyell havinge occasion to vse monye woulde still importune and Request the said Kyrkham and Kendall to pay to him his mony before the day did come that the same was due and somtymes to pay the same to others to whom the said Danyell did stande indebted, the which thinge to doe the said Kyrckham and Kendall for to pleasure the said Danyell weare very willyinge and did, soe that the said Kyrkham and Kendall weare neuer behinde hand in payinge the monie due vnto him by the said obligacon, but allwayes paid the same to the said Danyell or to others by his appointement before the same was due: vntill the Five and Twenteth day of October in the second yeare of his Majesty's Reygne that nowe is, at which tyme there was a new Composicon and Agreament at the Request of the said Danyell,

made betweene the said Danvell, and the said Kyrkham and the said Kendall, and others then partners in the same busines that the same bound shoulde be delivered vpp by the said Danyell to the said Kyrkham and Kendall to be Cancelled, and that the said Danyell shoulde have weekely paid vnto him by the said Kyrkham and Kendall and others partners in that busines Five shillinges of Lawfull mony of England dureinge such tyme as the said Kyrkham and Kendall or any others shoulde keepe or maintayne any such Children by vertue of the foresaid lettres patente, euery weeke that they the said Children did make or showe any exercises or shewes privately or publiquely vnto which the ["said"—interlined] Danyell did agree and for a longe tyme after receyued the said Five shillinges weekly accordinge to the said Agreement And confessinge that the said bond was fully satisfyed and discharged did promise to deliver the same to the said Kyrkham and Kendall to be Cancelled : yet notwithstandinge soe yt is may yt please [space filled with flourishes] your good Lordship that allthoughe the said Daniell doth verie well knowe all and singuler the premisses to be true, yet havinge a greedy and Covetuous minde, and knoweinge that your Orators cannot directly proue the paymente of the severall somes which weare payde vnto him at the tyme and place lymitted by the said Condicon of the said Obligacon accordinge to the stricte Course of the Common lawe for that diverse of the said somes weare payde in pryuate betweene themselues and some of them weare at the request of the said Danyell and by his appointement payd to others, and not to the said Danyell himselfe: And for that the said Danyell doth likewise knowe that your said Orator haue noe remedy by the course of the Common Lawe to get the said bond out of his handes the said Danyell hath nowe lately Commenced suyte vppon the said Obligacon against the said Kyrkham in his Majesty's Courte of the Kinges Benche meaninge to take the whole forfeyture of that said Obligacon against the said Kyrkham, and likewise doth giue out that he will Commence suyte against the said Anne Kendall vppon the same Obligacon, and doth seeke with all the expedicon he canne to recouer the penallty of the said obligacon against your said Orator Kyrkham contrarie to all righte, equitie and good Conscience: And albeit your said Orators have diverse and sundrie tymes earnestly required of the said Danyell to deliver the said obligacon to your said orators according to his promise, and to surcease his suyte vppon the same. yet that to doe he hath denyed and refused, and still doth deny and refuse contrarie to all Equity, right and good Conscience. In Consideracon whereof may yt please your good Lordship to award aswell the Kinges Majesty's most grateous write of Iniunction to be directed to the said Samuell Danyell, and all and euery his Counsellors Attorneyes, solicitors and Factors Commaundinge them therby noe further to proceed in the suyt vppon the said Obligacon against your said Orator Kyrkham vntyll your Lordship shall haue taken further Order and direction therein: As allsoe the Kinges Majesty's writ of Subpena to be directed to the said Samuell Danyell commaundinge him thereby at a certaine day and vnder a certaine paine therein to be lymited by your good Lordship to be and personally to appeare before your good Lordship in his Majesty's highe Courte of Chauncerie then and there to Aunsweare vnto the premisses, and further to abide such Order and direction therein as to your good Lordship shall seeme to stand with right, equity and good Conscience, And your said Orators shall dayly pray to god for the preservacon of your good Lordship in all happiness longe to Continue.

II

Jur. 12 Maij 1609.

The Aunswere of Samuell Danyell Deffendant to the Bill of Complaynte of Edward Kerkham and Anne Kendall Complaynantes.

This Deffendant saving to himselfe nowe and at all tymes hereafter all aduantages and benefytt of exception to the incerteyntie and insufficiency of the said Bill for Aunswere there vnto this Deffendant sayeth That true it is as he taketh it that the Kinges Majesty that nowe is by the earneste suite, meanes and indeavor of this deffendant which he performed with his greate labor costes and expences did by his Lettres Pattente Dated the Fowerth of February in the Firste vere of his highnes Reigne aucthorize and appoynte the said Edward Kirkeham and others in the said Bill menconed to trayne and bring vp certeyne children in the quality of Playinge by the name of the children of the Reuells in such sorte or to such effect as in the said Bill is expressed. For more certeyntie whereof this Deffendant refferreth himselfe to the said Letters Pattentes And further sayeth that for and in consideracon of his greate paynes and travell therein formerly taken aboute the tyme in the Bill menconed the said Complainant Edward Kirkham and one Thomas Kendall Deceased became bound vnto this Deffendant in the some of One hundred Poundes with condicon therevppon indorsed to such effect as in the Bill is declared, to which bond and condicon of the same this Deffendant for more certeyntic refferreth himselfe And further sayeth that after the said Complainant and Kendall had entred into the said bond he this Deffendant thinketh that he had satisfaccon to his contentement for all such some and somes of money as weare Dewe and payable yerely or monethly vnto him this Deffendant by the true intente and meaninge of the condicon of the said bond vntill the Eight and twentith of Aprill in the Third yere of his Majesty's reigne aboute which tyme this Deffendant by Letter of Attourney or otherwise by his Deede or writinge as he thinketh for good consideracon did assigne and settover the benefitt of the said obligacon and all such somme and sommes of money as he should or ought to receive by the same from thensforth As also the said bond vnto one John Gerrard synce which tyme this Deffendant neaver intermedled or had to doe with the said Complainants or Lettres Pattentes or eaver Demaunded any thinge of the Complainants as Dewe apperteyninge vnto him for the same And this Deffendant further sayeth that true it is that there was a speech of communicacon betwene this Deffendant and the Complainant Kirkh[" a "-interl.]m in the Bill menconed, that the said Complainant

Kirkeham and the others in the Bill menconed should paye Five shillinges weekelve to the said Deffendant as in the Bill is expressed For security whereof they the said Kirkham and others should become bounde by their obligacon and that vppon Seallinge and Deliuery of the said bond he this Deffendant would Deliuer his bond of One hundred Poundes but for that that noe such security was entred into the said Communicacon and speech Cessed and became voyde lonng before his assignement of the said bond to the said Gerrard. But this Deffendant hath heard that forasmuch as the said Complainants have not satisfyed and payd the said Annuity since the said Assignement in such manner as they ought to haue done according to the condicon of the said bonde he the said Gerrard hath vsed this Deffendant's name and put the same bond in suite by force of the said Letter of Attourney as this Deffendant thinketh it lawfull for him to doe and hopeth with the favor of this honorable Court he may prosecute the same for his Juste satisfaccon Without that that the said obligacon of the somme of One hundredd Poundes was made by the Complainant Kirkeham and the said Kendall in regarde of the paynes to be taken by the said Deffendant but for and in respecte of his paynes formerly taken in procurenge the said Pattente And without that that there was any agreemente concerninge the said Five shillinges weekely other then this Deffendant before in his Aunswere hath confessed And without that the Deffendant confessed that the said bond was fully satisfyed and discharged and did promisse to deliuer the same to the saide Kirkeham and Kendall to be cancelled in such sorte as in the said Bill is vntruely alleadged And without that that any other matter or thinge matervall or effectual in the Lawe to be Aunswered vnto and not herein confessed or avoyded traversed or Denyed is true to this Deffendant's knoledge All which matters this deffendant is ready to averr and prove as this honorable Court shall award and prayeth to be Dismissed with costes and charges here in this behalfe most wrongfully susteyned.

REVIVALS OF ENGLISH DRAMATIC WORKS, 1901–1918, 1926

By HAROLD CHILD

This list is intended to supplement, and in some points to correct, the list for 1919–1925, published in *Review of English Studies*, Vol. II., No. 6, April 1926, and has been compiled on the principles set out in the introductory note in that issue. Where any discrepancy between the two has escaped the notice of the compiler, the present list is more likely to be accurate than that of a year ago. It covers

the years 1901-18 and 1926.

The least satisfactory part of the list will certainly be found to be Section III., "Shakespeare and Shakespeare Apocrypha." Since a complete record of these revivals would be far too large to be set out here, the compiler has been reduced to following his fancy in making the selection; but he has done his best to mention all the productions in which an attempt was made to give the play complete, and to stage it in something resembling the Elizabethan manner. The pioneer in this work was Mr. William Poel; and the backward limit of time has been overstepped in order to give as complete as possible a record of Mr. Poel's revivals, whether through the Elizabethan Stage Society or other means of representation. The compiler's thanks are due to Mr. Poel for putting much material at his disposal; and the thanks of all lovers of Shakespeare in the theatre are due to Mr. Poel for the great reactionary revolution which, in the teeth of indifference and opposition, he has succeeded in bringing about. "Continuous" production, at least, is now the rule, rather than the exception.

Performances of Shakespeare and other Elizabethans at schools and colleges have, where possible, been included in the list; and also some of those performances by village players which are, happily, increasing in numbers. The productions of Steep, Hants. and of Shoreham, Kent, will be observed; and there have also been

Shakespeare Festivals at Angmering, in Sussex, of which the compiler regrets that he has not full particulars. In the acting of Elizabethans other than Shakespeare, the Marlowe Society at Cambridge and the Literary Society of Birkbeck College will be seen to be honourably eminent.

E

7

As before, only a selection has been made from innumerable performances of Everyman, She Stoops to Conquer, The Rivals, The

School for Scandal, and Caste.

Comparison of the two lists seems to show that the interest in miracles, in Restoration drama, and in the drama of the eighteenth century has been much greater since the war than it was from the beginning of the century to 1914; and those who have faith in English opera cannot fail to be attracted by the achievement of the Mayfair Dramatic Club in reviving old examples in this kind.

The compiler, regretting the incompleteness and imperfections of the list, is grateful to many correspondents who have sent him particulars for inclusion, and will be glad to receive notes of omissions

and errors.

I. MIRACLES.

Chester Plays. Salutation and Nativity; The Shepherds' Play. English Drama Society, Chester, November 1906; Bloomsbury Hall, December 4, 1906. Benson Company, Guildhall, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 22, 1909. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, January 1914.

The Shepherds' Play. Old Vic, December 1926.

The Deluge. Shoreham (Kent) Village Players, June 1926.

The Massacre of the Innocents. Benson Company, Guildhall, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 22, 1909.

Brome MS. The Sacrifice of Isaac. Elizabethan Stage Society, Great Hall, The Charterhouse, July 13, 1901; New Masonic Hall, Oxford, February 28, 1912.

Coventry Plays. The Nativity. Catholic Stage Guild, Cathedral Hall, Westminster, January 6, 1014.

Westminster, January 6, 1914.
Glastonbury Players, Church House, Westminster, December 1926. Made into an opera by Rutland Boughton and played in modern dress.

Coventry and York Plays. Nativity. "Taken from Miracle Plays presented during the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries by the Trade Guilds of Coventry and York." Wigmore Hall, February 13, 1917.

II. MORALITIES AND INTERLUDES

Everyman. First performance at The Charterhouse, by the Elizabethan Stage Society, July 13, 1901.

Operatic setting by Liza Lehmann, Shaftesbury Theatre,

December 28, 1915.

- The World and the Child (Mundus et Infans). Pupils of Mr. Nugent, Abbey Theatre, Dublin, March 7, 1912.
- The Interlude of Youth. English Drama Society, Bloomsbury Hall, December 12, 1905; Great Queen Street Theatre, January 8, 1906; Coronet Theatre, March 25, 1907. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, June 14, 1913.
- Hunnis or Udall. A Comedie or Enterlude . . . upon the Historie of Jacob and Esau. Elizabethan Stage Society, Little Theatre, March 6, 1911, and January 3, 1912; New Masonic Hall, Oxford, February 28, 1912.
- Heywood, John. The Pardoner and the Friar. Birkbeck College Theatre, December 7, 1923.

III. SHAKESPEARE AND SHAKESPEARE APOCRYPHA

- The Tempest. Elizabethan Stage Society, Egyptian Hall, Mansion House, 1897; Goldsmiths' Hall, 1897, and elsewhere.
 O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, February, 1910.
 Masters and boys of Denstone College, November 25, 1926.
- The Two Gentlemen of Verona. Elizabethan Stage Society, Merchant Tailors' Hall, 1896; Great Hall, The Charterhouse, January 18, 1897; His Majesty's Theatre, April 20, 1910; Gaiety Theatre Manchester, 1910.

 And see previous list.
- Measure for Measure. Elizabethan Stage Society, Royalty Theatre, 1893. O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, February 1906.

Oscar Asche, Adelphi Theatre, March 1906.

Miss Horniman's Company, in Elizabethan manner, Gaiety Theatre, Manchester, 1908, and Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 21 and 22, 1908.

Birmingham Repertory Theatre, April 1918. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, 1925.

The Comedy of Errors. Elizabethan Stage Society, Gray's Inn Hall, 1895; Court Theatre, October 1904, then on tour, ending at Terry's Theatre, December 1904.

By children of L.C.C. South Hackney Central School, Apothecaries'

Hall, June 3, 1919.

Much Ado about Nothing. O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, May 20.

Ellen Terry (Staged by Gordon Craig), Imperial Theatre, May 23, 1903. As Beatrice at her Jubilee Celebration, Drury Lane,

June 1006.

Elizabethan Stage Society: Seven performances by arrangement with London School Board in London Townhalls, March 1904: Court Theatre, March 19, 1904; Lecture Hall, Burlington House, April 22, 1904.

Love's Labour's Lost. Tercentenary celebrations of Charterhouse School, in open air, July 8, 1911. Boys of Gresham's School, Holt, in open air, July 1913.

A Midsummer Night's Dream. O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, February 1908. Granville Barker, Savoy Theatre, February 6, 1914.

Bradfield College, Gray Pit, June 24, 1916.

The Merchant of Venice. Elizabethan Stage Society, St. George's Hall, December 1898, and Grand Theatre, Fulham, June 1907.

O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, May 18, 1903.

Children of L.C.C. and other Schools at Shakespeare Exhibition, Whitechapel Art Gallery, Autumn 1910.

Arthur Bourchier (under direction of Patrick Kirwan) on apron stage without footlights, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 20, 1914.

Birmingham Repertory Theatre, complete text, on apron stage, October 1915 (time taken in representation, 23 hours).

As You Like It. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, in the Elizabethan manner, October 1921.

O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, February 1904.

E. A. Sothern and Julia Marlowe, Waldorf (now Strand) Theatre, April 29, 1907. L.C.C. School Children, Shakespeare Exhibition, Whitechapel

Art Gallery, Autumn 1910.

The Taming of the Shrew. O.U.D.S. New Theatre, Oxford, February

Martin Harvey, in Elizabethan manner, Grand Theatre, Hull, March 4, 1913; Prince of Wales' Theatre, May 10, 1913, and elsewhere.

Katherine and Petruchio (Garrick's version of the Shrew). H. B. Tree, Her Majesty's Theatre, November 1, 1897.

All's Well That Ends Well. Elizabethan Stage Society, Ethical Church, Queen's Road, Bayswater, May 20 and 29, 1920. Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April

1916.

And see previous list.

- Twelfth Night. Elizabethan Stage Society, Lecture Hall, Burlington Gardens, 1895, and April 23, 1903; Middle Temple Hall, February 12, 1897; Court Theatre, June 1903.
 - E. A. Sothern and Julia Marlowe, Waldorf (now Strand) Theatre, April 1907.
 - Granville Barker, Savoy Theatre, November 15, 1912.
 - Birmingham Repertory Theatre, without cuts and with apron stage, March 1016 and April 1016.
 - Steep Shakespeare Players, Steep, Hants., in Elizabethan manner, July 1, 1923.
- The Winter's Tale. O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, February 1911. Granville Barker, Savoy Theatre, September 21, 1912. The Young Players, Little Theatre, July 17, 1917. All the parts
- acted by females. King John. H. B. Tree, Her Majesty's Theatre, September 20, 1899. Henry Talbot Dramatic Club, Athenæum, Glasgow, May 1907. L.C.C. children at Whitechapel Art Gallery Shakespeare Exhibition, Autumn 1910.
 - Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, August
- King Richard II. Elizabethan Stage Society, Lecture Theatre, Burlington Gardens, November 11, 1899.

 - Marlowe Society, Cambridge, February 11, 1910. Boys of Sawston, Cambridge, Village School, May 1910.
 - L.C.C. School Children, at Shakespeare Exhibition, Whitechapel Art Gallery, Autumn 1910.
- I King Henry IV. "Costume Revival" by Charles Fry, St. George's Hall, November 23, 1901.
 - Marlowe Society, Cambridge, 1909.
 - H. B. Tree, His Majesty's Theatre, November 14, 1914.
 - I King Henry IV. and 2 King Henry IV. were given consecutively on one day, Birmingham Repertory Theatre, April 23, 1921.
- 2 King Henry IV. "Costume Revival" by Charles Fry, at St. George's Hall, November 30, 1901.
 - O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, February 1926.
- King Henry V. Ben Greet Company for Elizabethan Stage Society, Lecture Theatre, Burlington Gardens, November 21, 1901; Theatre Metropole, Camberwell, April 23, 1901.
 - Boys of King Edward VI.'s Grammar School, Stratford-upon-Avon, May 7, 1913.
 - Martin Harvey, continuous production, with rear stage and side doors, His Majesty's Theatre, May 29, 1916.
- 1, 2 and 3 King Henry VI. Benson Company, at the Stratford Festival, May 1906. (First recorded performance of three parts in succession.)

Troilus and Cressida. Charles Fry, Great Queen Street (now Kingsway) Theatre, June 1907.

On a draped stage. Said to have been the first performance of Shakespeare's play since his death. J. P. Kemble prepared it for the stage, but never produced it.

Elizabethan Stage Society, King's Hall, December 10, 1912.

Streatham Shakespearean Players (for Elizabethan Stage Society). Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, May 12, 1913. Marlowe Society, Cambridge, 1922.

Romeo and Juliet. Esmé Beringer as Romeo, Vera Beringer as Juliet. Prince of Wales's Theatre, 1896.

Elizabethan Stage Society, with "boy and girl" Romeo and Juliet (Esmé Percy and Dorothy Minto), Royalty Theatre, May 5,

E. A. Sothern and Julia Marlowe, Waldorf (now Strand) Theatre, May 2, 1907.

Steep Shakespeare Players, Steep, Hants., in Elizabethan manner, June 24 and 26, 1926.

Timon of Athens. J. H. Leigh, Court Theatre, May 18, 1904. And see previous list.

Julius Cæsar. O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, February 1912. Shoreham (Kent) Village Players, in open air, 1025. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, 1925.

Macbeth, Elizabethan Stage Society, Grand Theatre, Fulham, June 22 to 26, 1909.

Cinematograph version by D. W. Griffith, with H. B. Tree as Macbeth, His Majesty's Theatre, June 1916.

Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, 1926.

Hamlet. Text of the First Quarto, by the Elizabethan Stage Society "the first public performance in England before curtains"), St. George's Hall, April 16, 1881. Again at Carpenters' Hall, February 21, 1900.

A version by William Poel, including scenes usually omitted, at the Little Theatre, January 27, 1914.

Sarah Bernhardt, in French, Garrick Theatre, June 28, 1902.

H. B. Tree, without scenery, Town Hall, Oxford, March 13, 1905;

His Majesty's Theatre, March 24, 1905. E. A. Sothern and Julia Marlowe, Waldorf (now Strand) Theatre, May 1, 1907.

Goldsmiths' College Amateur Dramatic Society, Goldsmiths' College, New Cross, December 14, 1911.

The complete text of the Folio by the Benson Company at Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, July 1911 and April 1912; and at Old Vic (Ben Greet), April 29, 1916, April 1917, and April

1018.

- Masters and boys of Denstone College, November 1912.
- Martin Harvey, with new setting from designs by Max Reinhardt, King's Theatre, Glasgow, April 5, 1913.
- Ruggero Ruggeri, in Italian, Globe Theatre, April 1926.
- King Lear. Pavilion Theatre, London, E., a Yiddish version by Moscovitch and Waxman, January 10, 1913.
- Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, May and June 1926.
- Othello. In Yiddish at the Pavilion, Whitechapel, by Mr. and Mrs.
 - S. Feinmann, May 10, 1909. Grasso and Sicilian Players, in Italian, Lyric Theatre, March 1910. King's College Dramatic Society, King's College, December 5, 1926. In modern dress.
- Cymbeline. Charles Fry, on draped stage, Court Theatre, November 7, 1008.
- Birmingham Repertory Theatre, April 21, 1922, in modern dress. Pericles, Prince of Tyre. Reading by British Empire Shakespeare Society.
- Botanical Theatre, University College, January 13, 1914. Fellowship of Players, New Scala Theatre, March 14, 1926.
- Sir Thomas More. See under Munday.
- Arden of Feversham. Marlowe Society, Cambridge, 1921. Students of Birkbeck College, December 7 and 18, 1923 (and not as in previous list).
- The King and the Countess. (The episode in The Raigne of King Edward III of the wooing of the Countess of Salisbury by the King, arranged by William Poel). Elizabethan Stage Society, Steinway Hall, May 2, 1890; St. George's Hall, July 9, 1897; Little Theatre, March 6 and 12, 1911. Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, iv. 9.
- Fratricide Punished. Elizabethan Stage Society, Little Theatre, December 1924.
 - Fellowship of Players, Apollo Theatre, April 18, 1926. And see previous list.

IV. OTHER ELIZABETHANS

- Anonymous, The Return from Parnassus (2 and 3 Parnassus). Elizabethan Stage Society, Apothecaries' Hall, June 3, 1919. "For the first time in London."
- Beaumont and Fletcher, and Fletcher. The Faithful Shepherdess. Mermaid Society, Botanical Gardens, July 6, 1903.
 - The Knight of the Burning Pestle. Mermaid Society, Royalty Theatre, November 13, 1904, and May 1905.
 - Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 1910.

Miss Horniman's Company, Gaiety Theatre, Manchester, December 24, 1908, and Coronet Theatre, February 13, 1911.

Marlowe Dramatic Society, Victoria Assembly Rooms, Cambridge, February 24, 1911.

Birmingham Repertory Theatre, August 30, 1919 (and not as in previous list).

The Maid's Tragedy. Mermaid Society, Royalty Theatre, December 5, 1904.

Play Actors, Court Theatre, October 18, 1908.

The Wild Goose Chase. Idyllic Players, under Patrick Kirwan, Botanical Gardens, July 18, 1904; and Gardens of Leighton House, July 19, 1909.

The Coxcomb. Elizabethan Stage Society, Inner Temple Hall, 1898.

Philaster. Students of Birkbeck College, December 11 and 12, 1925.

The Triumph of Death. Marlowe Society, Cambridge, 1920.

Wit Without Money, translated into Czech, and entitled The Taming of the Swashbuckler, was produced at the Vinohrady Theatre, Prague, June 1926.

Chapman, Jonson, and Marston. Eastward Ho! University College, London, March 11, 1913.

Day. Humour out of Breath. Anna Mather Company, Conservatoire, Hampstead, November 27, 1902.

Dekker. The Shoemaker's Holiday. Guild of Handicraft, Town Hall, Chipping Campden, January 1908.

O.U.D.S., New Theatre, Oxford, January 29, 1913.

Old Vic., March 22, 1926.

Shoreham (Kent) Village Players, Club Hall, Sevenoaks, December 1 and 2, 1926.

Dekker and Ford. The Sun's Darling. English Drama Society, Queen's Gate Hall, October 31, 1906.

Field. A Woman is a Weathercock. Patrick Kirwan's Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 27, 1914.

Ford. The Broken Heart. Elizabethan Stage Society, St. George's Hall, 1898.

Mermaid Society, Royalty Theatre, November 21, 1904.

Greene. Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Students of Birkbeck College, June 1920.

The Scottish History of King James IV. Students of Birkbeck College, December 10 and 11, 1026.

Jonson. The Alchemist. Elizabethan Stage Society, Apothecaries'
Hall, February 24, 1899; Imperial Theatre, July 1902; New
Theatre, Cambridge, August 4, 1902.

Marlowe Society, Cambridge, 1914.

Birmingham Repertory Theatre, April 8, 1916.

- Epicæne. Mermaid Society, Great Queen Street (now Kingsway)
 Theatre, May 8, 1905.
 - Marlowe Society, Cambridge, February 1909.
- Every Man in his Humour. Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 23, 1903.
- Volpone. Marlowe Society, Cambridge, 1923.
- The Case is Altered. Students of Birkbeck College, December 1924.
- The Poetaster. Elizabethan Stage Society, Apothecaries' Hall, April 26, 1916; Small Theatre, Albert Hall, April 27, 1916.
- The Sad Shepherd. Elizabethan Stage Society, Courtyard of Fulham Palace, July 23, 1898.
- Kyd. The Spanish Tragedy. Students of Birkbeck College, December 1921.
- Lyly. Campaspe. Students of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, December 7, 1908.
 - Gallathea. Patrick Kirwan's Company, Botanical Gardens, July 1905; and Gardens of Leighton House, July 1909.
- Marlowe. Doctor Faustus. Elizabethan Stage Society, "on a stage after the model of the old Fortune Playhouse," St. George's Hall, June 1896; Court Theatre, October 1904; then on tour, and Terry's Theatre, December 1904.
 - Edward II. Students of Birkbeck College, December 1920.
 - " First time in London for 330 years."
 - Marlowe Society, Cambridge, A.D.C. Theatre, Cambridge, March 1926.
- Massinger. A New Way to Pay Old Debts. Marlowe Society, Cambridge, March 9, 1912.
- Middleton. The Chaste Maide of Cheapside. Shakespeare's England Exhibition, Earls Court, September 16, 1912.
- Middleton and Rowley. The Spanish Gipsy. Elizabethan Stage Society, St. George's Hall, 1898.
- (?) Munday and Dekker. Sir Thomas More. Students of Birkbeck College, December 1922. Crosby Hall, March 24, 1926.
- Peele. The Old Wives' Tale. By School Girls, Hendon Hall, July 12, 1902.
 - Patrick Kirwan's Company, Gardens of Leighton House, July 1909. Students of Birkbeck College, June 1919.
- Porter. The Two Angry Women of Abington. Patrick Kirwan's Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 21, 1914.

Webster. The Duchess of Malfi. Independent Theatre, rearranged for the modern stage by William Poel, Opéra Comique, October 25, 1892.

Marlowe Society, Cambridge, March 1924.

The White Devil. Marlowe Society, Cambridge, 1920. Phænix Society, Court Theatre, April 11 and 12, 1926.

V. MASQUES AND OPERAS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

- Betterton. Dioclesian. Purcell Operatic Society, Coronet Theatre, March 25, 1901.
- Campion. Masque for the marriage of the Earl of Somerset and Lady Frances Howard (1614). Under the name The Golden Tree, by students of Guildhall School of Music, June 29, 1905.
- Daniel. The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses. Patrick Kirwan's Company, Botanical Gardens, July 6, 1908; and Garden of Leighton House, July 20, 1909.
- Jonson. The Hue and Cry after Cupid. (Lord Haddington's Masque.) Mermaid Society, Botanical Gardens, July 1, 1903.
 - The Vision of Delight. Kingsway Theatre, May 14, 1908.
 Coronation Gala Performance, His Majesty's Theatre, June 27, 1911.
 Three Arts Club Foundation performance, His Majesty's Theatre, May 21, 1912.
 - Pan's Anniversary, or The Shepherd's Holy Day. Shakespeare Club of Stratford-upon-Avon, Bancroft Gardens, Stratford, in open air, April 24, 1905.
- Milton. Comus. Mermaid Society at Botanical Gardens, July 1, 1903; at Unveiling of Statue at St. Giles's, Cripplegate, November 2, 1904.

Members of Cambridge University, Milton Tercentenary Celebrations, New Theatre, Cambridge, July 1908.

Caxton Hall, March 1910.

Tate. Dido and Eneas. Purcell Operatic Society, Coronet Theatre, March 25, 1901.
 Royal Manchester College of Music, College Hall, July 1914.
 Alton Choral Society, Assembly Rooms, Alton, February 10, 1926.
 Theatre Royal, Bristol, October 21, 1926.

VI. RESTORATION PERIOD

Buckingham. The Rehearsal. Bessle Comedy Company, Temperance Hall, Sheffield, November 22, 1912.

Congreve. The Double Dealer. Stage Society, Queen's Theatre, May 14 and 15, 1916.

- Love for Love. Stage Society, Aldwych Theatre, April 15 and 16, 1917.

 The Way of the World. Stage Society, King's Hall, May 12, 1918.

 Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, 1923.
- Dryden. Marriage à la Mode. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, February 8, 1926.
- Farquhar. The Recruiting Officer. Stage Society, Haymarket Theatre, January 24, 1915.
 - The Beaux' Stratagem. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, November 1, 1926.
- Milton. Samson Agonistes. Elizabethan Stage Society, Lecture Theatre, Victoria and Albert Museum, April 7, 1900 ("first time in England"); St. George's Hall, April 11, 1900; Theatre, Burlington Gardens (Milton Tercentenary), December 15, 1908.
- Vanbrugh. The Confederacy. Mermaid Society, Royalty Theatre, November 28, 1904; Great Queen Street (now Kingsway) Theatre, May 15, 1905. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, October and November, 1920.
- Wycherley. The Country Wife. Everyman Theatre, Hampstead, December 13, 1926. See also under Garrick: The Country Girl.

VII. EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

A. Plays

- Carey, Henry. Chrononhotonthologos. East London College Theatre, November 3, 4, and 5, 1926.
- Colman, George, the Elder. The Jealous Wife. East London College Theatre, February 4, 1926.
- Colman and Garrick. The Clandestine Marriage. Cyril Maude, Haymarket Theatre, March 17, 1903. Playhouse, March 25, 1907. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, December 1915.
- Colman, the Younger. The Heir-at-Law. Cyril Maude, Waldorf (now Strand) Theatre, March 20, 1906.
- Cowley, Hannah. The Belle's Stratagem. Benson Company, Coronet Theatre, February 19 and March 4, 1909; Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 21, 1909.

 Harcourt Williams, Court Theatre, July 8, 1913.
- Cumberland. The Jew. Strand Theatre, May 8, 1917.
- Fielding. Tom Thumb. East London College Theatre, November 3, 4 and 5, 1926.

Foote. The Liar. Arthur Bourchier, London Coliseum, May 1916.

Garrick. The Country Girl. Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 26, 1907; Coronet Theatre, February 21, 1908.

Birmingham Repertory Theatre, November 20, 1926.

Katherine and Petruchio. See under Shakespeare: The Taming of the Shrew.

Goldsmith. The Good-natur'd Man. Pupils of Victoria College, Jersey, December 20, 1903.

William Poel, New Theatre, Cambridge, August 9 and 10, 1906, and Coronet Theatre, October 11, 1906.

She Stoops to Conquer. Old Comedy Society, Albert Hall, March 15, 1904.

Benson Company, Coronet Theatre, February 18, 1906, and fre-

quently elsewhere.

Waldorf (now Strand) Theatre, February 17, 1906. Haymarket Theatre, February 20, 1909. Old Vic., January 21, 1918. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, March 1, 1919. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, 1923.

Holcroft. He's Much to Blame. Terry's Theatre, September 29, 1906 (shortened version).

The Road to Ruin. Henry Herbert, Coronet Theatre, March 1915.

Inchbald, Elizabeth. Every One has his Fault. East London College Theatre, April 22, 1926.

The Wedding Day. Sock and Buskin Company, Wortley Hall, Finsbury Park, April 24, 1902.

Morton, Thomas. Speed the Plough. East London College Theatre, June 1926.

Murphy. The Way to Keep Him. Old Comedy Society, Albert Hall,
 May 17, 1904.
 East London College Theatre, March 4, 1926.

Reynolds, Frederic. The Dramatist. Old Comedy Society, Bijou (now Century) Theatre, Bayswater, October 29, 1903.

Sheridan, R. B. The Rivals. Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, April 1902. Stockport Garrick Society, Theatre Royal, Stockport, February 1905. Cripplegate Club, Cripplegate Institute, December 4, 1909. Lewis Waller, Lyric Theatre, April 4, 1910. City of Oxford A.D.C., New Theatre, Oxford, December 14, 1911. Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, August 6, 1912; and later. Old Vic (Sheridan Centenary), September 27, 1916. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, 1920. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, March and November 1922.

- The School for Scandal. Edward Compton, St. James's Theatre, September 14, 1907. H. B. Tree, His Majesty's Theatre, April 7, 1909, and April 12, 1913. City of Oxford A.D.C., New Theatre, Oxford, December 16, 1909. Gaiety Theatre, Manchester, December 24, 1913. Old Vic, April 17, 1914. Royal Command performance, Covent Garden, February 2, 1915. Old Vic Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon (Sheridan Centenary), August 1916; and in London later. Maddermarket Theatre, Norwich, 1922.
- The Critic. Mermaid Society, Great Queen Street (now Kingsway)
 Theatre, April 24, 1905. Benson Company, Memorial Theatre,
 Stratford-upon-Avon, April 22, 1911. His Majesty's Theatre,
 Coronation Gala performance, June 27, 1911. Birmingham
 Repertory Theatre, November 1913, January and June 1914.
 Aldwych Theatre (Sheridan Centenary), June 1916. East
 London College Theatre, December 9, 1926.

Arranged as an opera in two acts, music by Charles Villiers Stanford, Shaftesbury Theatre, January 14, 1916.

B. Operas

- Bickerstaffe. Thomas and Sally. Included in entertainment, Riverside Nights, Lyric Theatre, Hammersmith, April 10, 1926.
 - Love in a Village. Mayfair Dramatic Club, Guildhall School of Music, May 1923, and Century Theatre, Bayswater, November 1923. Little Theatre Repertory Company, Leeds, March 22, 1926 (and not as in previous list).
 - The Maid of the Mill. Mayfair Dramatic Club, New Scala Theatre, November 1924.
 - Lionel and Clarissa. Thespis Dramatic Club, Cripplegate Institute, January 8, 1907. Mayfair Dramatic Club, Birkbeck Theatre, May 1924 (and not as in previous list).
- Brooke, Mrs. Rosina. Mayfair Dramatic Club, Guildhall School of Music, January 1923.
- Cobb, James. The Cherokee. Little Theatre Repertory Company, Leeds, October 27, 1926.
 - The Haunted Tower. Mayfair Dramatic Club, Guildhall School of Music, May 1922.
 - The Siege of Belgrade. Mayfair Dramatic Club, New Scala Theatre, March 1926.
- Gay and others. Acis and Galatea. Bishopsgate Institute, December 2, 1926.
- Sheridan. The Duenna. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, December 26, 1924.

A new production, not a repetition of that of May 1923.

VIII. NINETEENTH CENTURY

Albery, James, and Dilley, Joseph. Chiselling. Coronet Theatre, July 1907.

Gilbert à Beckett. Last of the Legends. Terry's Theatre, March 9, 1907.

Boucicault. Arrah-na-Pogue. Marlowe Dramatic Club, St. George's Hall, May 18, 1901. Middlesex Theatre, June 10, 1912.

- The Colleen Bawn. West London Theatre, June 24, 1901. Alexandra Hall, Ilfracombe, March 31, 1913. Theatre Royal, Belfast, July 13, 1914.
- The Corsican Brothers. Martin Harvey, Dublin, November 1906, and in London and elsewhere.
- Dot ("The Cricket on the Hearth"). Arthur Bourchier, Garrick Theatre, December 1, 1903. Charles Groves, Terry's Theatre, December 1, 1906.
- London Assurance. King George Pension Fund Command performance, His Majesty's Theatre, June 27, 1913.
- Louis XI. Laurence Irving, Lyceum Theatre, July 1, 1901. H. B. Irving, Theatre Royal, Manchester, September 26, 1907; Shaftesbury Theatre, February 22, 1909; Queen's Theatre, April 30, 1910, and on tour.
- Rip Van Winkle. Royalty Theatre, February 6, 1908.

The Shaughraun. Brixton Theatre, July 5, 1909.

- Brough, William. The Field of the Cloth of Gold. County Theatre, Kingston-on-Thames, September 30, 1901.
- Browning. Colombe's Birthday. Birmingham University Literary and Dramatic Society, Edgbaston Assembly Rooms, January 31, 1907.
 - Pippa Passes. English Drama Society, Fortune Playhouse, Brewer Street, Regent Street, January 25, 1909.
 - A Soul's Tragedy. Stage Society, Court Theatre, March 13, 14, and 15, 1904.

No record of previous performance.

- In a Balcony. English Drama Society, Bijou (now Century) Theatre, Bayswater, June 8, 1905, and Queen's Gate Hall, March 8, 1908.
- Burnand. Cox and Box. King's Theatre, Hammersmith, February 21, 1910. Newcastle-on-Tyne Amateur Operatic Society, Tyne Theatre, Newcastle-on-Tyne, April 14, 1913.
 - The Turn of the Tide. Sadlers Wells, November 10, 1902.
- Buckstone, J. B. The Green Bushes. Grand Theatre, Islington, September 14, 1903.
 - Good for Nothing. Dalton Dramatic Club, Balham Assembly Rooms, September 27, 1903. Aldwych Theatre, January 18, 1909. Coronet Theatre, August 1910.

- Byron, Lord. Manfred. Stage Society, Drury Lane Theatre, July 29, 1918.
- Byron, H. J. Our Boys. Vaudeville Theatre, November 20, 1914.
- Coleridge. Wallenstein (with scenes from The Piccolomini). Elizabethan Stage Society, Hall of Christ's Hospital, June 23, 1900; and at Oxford Summer Meeting, August 1911.
- Gilbert. Engaged. Royal Academy of Music Dramatic Students, St. George's Hall, March 26, 1901.
 - The Palace of Truth. Royal Academy of Music Dramatic Students, St. George's Hall, July 12, 1901, and December 13, 1909. Mermaid Society, Great Queen Street (now Kingsway) Theatre, May 23, 1905; Players of the Gate, Kennington Theatre, June 3, 1918.
 - Pygmalion and Galatea. Ray Pozner, St. George's Hall, March 28, 1901. Miss Bateman's Pupils, St. George's Hall, July 10, 1901. Royal Academy of Music Dramatic Students, Wyndham's Theatre, December 11, 1901. Sheffield Society of Artists, Cutlers' Hall, Sheffield, March 1903. Great Queen Street (now Kingsway) Theatre, June 25, 1907. City of London Dramatic Club, Hackney Empire, November 7, 1912. King's Hall, May 23, 1913. His Majesty's Theatre, 1916. Mary Anderson (in a condensed version), London Coliseum, April 23, 1917.
 - The Wicked World. As Libretto for Edward German's Opera, Moon Fairies, Sterling Mackinlay Operatic Society, King's Hall, May 14, 1915.
- Lewis, Leopold. The Bells. H. B. Irving, Queen's Theatre, September 1909; Savoy Theatre, May 19, 1917, and on tour.
- Lytton. Money. Understudies at Prince of Wales's Theatre, January 22, 1901. Royal Command Performance, Drury Lane, May 17, 1901.
 - The Lady of Lyons. Murray Amateur Dramatic Society, Durham Hall, Finsbury Park, November 28, 1913. Hirwain Amateur Dramatic Society, Victoria Hall, June 4, 1914.
 - Richelieu. Robert Hilton, Coronet Theatre, April 5, 1909, and elsewhere in and about London. Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, August 1913. Edward Compton, King's Theatre, Hammersmith, April 1914, and elsewhere.
- Martin, Theodore. King Rene's Daughter. Woodland Players, Botanical Gardens, June 17, 1902. Worcester branch of British Empire Shakespeare Society, April 1913. Old Vic, January 18, 1915.
- Planché. The King of the Peacocks. Birmingham Repertory Theatre, December 26, 1921.
 - The Camp at the Olympic (a shortened version, entitled A Prelude).
 East London College Theatre, November 3, 4, and 5, 1926.

- Reade, Charles. It's Never too late to Mend. Greenwich, April 20, 1908. Middlesex Theatre, June 17, 1912.
 - The Lyons Mail (adaptation from Le Courier de Lyon by Moreau and others). H. B. Irving, Shaftesbury Theatre, October 15, 1908, and elsewhere in London and on tour. A.D.C., Cambridge, June 1914. Officers of 5th Battalion (D.C.O.), Middlesex Regiment, Court Theatre, February 8 and 9, 1918.
- Reade, Charles, and Taylor, Tom. Masks and Faces. Palace, Hull, April 1901. Benson Company, Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, July 29, 1910. Thames Valley Shakespeare Society, Hippodrome, Richmond, January 24, 1914. Old Vic, March 30, 1918. King George Pension Fund performance, His Majesty's Theatre, December 17, 1918.
 - Peg Woffington (an adaptation of Masks and Faces). Prince of Wales's Theatre, February 13, 1901.
 - Peg Woffington (another adaptation, made by Laurence Irving). Grand Theatre, Birmingham, January 27, 1908, and London Coliseum, February 17, 1908.
- Robertson, T. W. Caste. Cyril Maude, Haymarket Theatre, April 26, 1902. Marie Tempest, Criterion Theatre, May 23, 1903. George Alexander, St. James's Theatre, July 1, 1909 (a matinée performance). Coronet Theatre, July 22, 1909, and June 25, 1910. King's Theatre, Hammersmith, August 4, 1913. Brighton Stock Company, Palace Pier, Brighton, April 22, 1916; and very frequently by dramatic societies and amateurs.
 - David Garrick (adapted from the French). Charles Wyndham, New Theatre, May 26, 1904. Coronet Theatre, August 23, 1910. Coronation Command performance, His Majesty's Theatre, June 27, 1911. Martin Harvey, Buxton, August 21, 1916, and Comedy Theatre (a matinée performance), January 8, 1918; and by dramatic societies and amateurs.
 - Home (adapted from L'Aventurière by Emile Augier). Coronet Theatre, July 25, 1910. Alexander Dramatic Club, Surrey Masonic Hall, March 6, 1911.
 - M.P. Coronet Theatre, June 6, 1910.
 - Ours. Coronet Theatre, July 12, 1909, and August 10, 1910. Southampton Amateur Dramatic Society, March 10, 1913.
 - Progress (adapted from Les Gamaches, by Sardou). Coronet Theatre, July 18, 1910.
 - School. Hampstead Dramatic Society, King's Hall, December 7, 1907. Coronet Theatre, June 28, 1909, and June 1910. Rehearsal Company, Passmore Edwards Settlement, Tavistock Place, February 22, 1912.
 - Society. Coronet Theatre, June 30, 1920.

- Shelley. The Cenci. Sybil Thorndike, Empire Theatre, March 8 and other days, 1926.
- Stephenson, B. C., and Scott, Clement. Diplomacy (adapted from Sardou's Dora). Gerald du Maurier, Wyndham's Theatre, March 26, 1913. Newcastle Amateurs, Tyne Theatre, Newcastle-on-Tyne, July 14, 1913.
- Swinburne. Atalanta in Calydon. School of Art, Crystal Palace, June 7 and 9, 1906.
- Taylor, Tom. Lady Clancarty (revised version, entitled Clancarty).

 Lewis Waller, Lyric Theatre, April 16, 1907.
 - Still Waters Run Deep (adapted from Le Gendre by De Bernard). Wyndham's Theatre, May 14, 1902.
 - The Ticket-of-Leave Man (adapted from Le Retour de Melun, by Brise-barre and Nuz). Lodge-Percy Repertory Company, July 6, 1914.
- Taylor, Tom, and Lang, T. Plot and Passion. Martin Harvey Dramatic Club and others, Coronet Theatre, November 15, 1909. The Isis Players, 60, Paddington-street, February 12, 1926.
- Wills, W. G. Charles I. Henry Irving and Ellen Terry, Lyceum Theatre, June 24, 1901; and June 26, 1902. H. B. Irving, Shaftesbury Theatre, February 15, 1909.
 - Medea in Corinth (adapted from the French of Legouvé). Court Theatre, July 2, 1907.

THE DIALECTS OF THE WEST MIDLANDS IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

BY MARY S. SERJEANTSON

II

Distribution of Dialect Features

(1) OE. &.

Prim. OE. &, except when affected by combinative changes, remained in most of the OE. dialects until the end of the OE. period. In some dialects, however, notably in that of Kent, OE. & was raised to & very early. The e-type is found also in the OE. charters of Surrey and Suffolk,* and in the dialect represented by the Vespasian Psalter and the Royal Glosses—apparently a Midland dialect, though its locality has not yet been determined exactly.

The æ-type appears regularly in the West Saxon and Northumbrian texts, and in certain other dialects such as that of Rushworth.1 Further, OE. charters relating to lands in the West Midlands (chiefly Worcestershire) have a; the only exceptions in the charters which I have examined are efter (once in Warwickshire charter, 998), and pes (twice in a tenth-century Staffordshire charter). The Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, and Herefordshire charters have invariably a, written a, ae, and once e. † These documents all show a marked deviation from West Saxon on such points as the raising of \bar{a}^1 to \bar{e} , the absence of fracture of \bar{a} before $l+\cos l$, the treatment of ea before i-, j-, etc. The evidence gives no support to the view that the raising of & to & in Early OE, was a distinctive feature of the West Midland dialects. On the other hand, the absence of e-spellings, except in the cases mentioned above, does not prove definitely that the "zweite Aufhellung," as Luick calls it, did not take place in the West Midlands. The regular æ may be due to West Saxon influence; if so, it is remark-

[•] Wyld, South-Eastern and South-East Midland Dialects, p. 117.

[†] Altogether more than 120 &-forms (eighth to tenth century) compared with the three e-forms mentioned above.

able that scribes all agree in adhering to the West Saxon usage with regard to this vowel, though frequently adopting the local type in other cases.

The regular æ-forms in the West Midland charters further suggest that the Vespasian Psalter, usually regarded as West Midland, may not be from this area. It may represent a Central Midland dialect. It is possible that in some area in the Central Midlands, bordering on East Anglia or the South-East, OE. æ became e, as in the South-Eastern dialects. If the Vespasian Psalter is not western, it follows that it does not represent the same dialect as that of the Katherine group.

At the end of the OE, period there seem to have been two tendencies in the West Midland dialects: (a) to retract OE. a to a; (b) to raise OE. a to e. The ME, texts and place-names of Gloucestershire have regularly a for OE, &. The same is true of the place-names of Staffordshire and Derbyshire (Rauenesdal, Haselegh, etc.). This agrees with the a-type which is apparently normal in the Central Midlands. On the other hand, there are indications that in the dialects of the remaining West Midland counties a was raised to e in Late OE. The e-type is found, (a) in the late eleventh-century Worcestershire Cartulary (e rarely; usually a); (b) in the Worcester Fragments (c. 1180; also a; a after w); (c) in Lazamon A (c. 1205; e and æ are used, both indicating a front vowel, probably [e]); (d) in the Harley Lyrics (c. 1310; a is the usual form, but e is still fairly common). There are traces of e-forms in the thirteenth-century place-names from the records of Worcestershire, Shropshire, Cheshire, Lancashire,* and Warwickshire (Espele, Revenstret, Revenshull, etc.). After the beginning of the fourteenth century, e for OE. & disappears in both texts and place-names; for instance, the poems of Herebert (c. 1330) have always a. The spread of this latter type must be due to the influence of the Central Midland dialect and that of Gloucestershire.

(2) OE. \$\bar{a}^1\$ (from W.Gmc. \$\bar{a}\$).

West Gmc. \bar{a} , except before a nasal or before a back consonant followed by a back vowel, was fronted in Prim. OE. to \bar{a} . The vowel \bar{a} remained in the South-Western dialects until early ME., when it was raised to $[\bar{\epsilon}]$. In the dialects of the South-East and in those of the greater part of the Midlands, \bar{a} became $[\bar{\epsilon}]$ in early

The only form in Lancashire and Cheshire is Hesil-, which is perhaps Scandinavian.

OE. and remained as such in ME. ME. scribes do not distinguish as a rule between $[\tilde{e}]$ and $[\tilde{e}]$, but use \tilde{e} for both. A few twelfth and thirteenth century MSS. have α or ea to represent a slack $[\tilde{e}]$. When no distinction in spelling is made, some indication of the quality of the vowel in a specific dialect may usually be obtained (a) from rhymes, (b) from words containing OE. $\bar{\alpha}^1$ shortened before a consonant group. The latter test would be more reliable if the relative chronology of the ME. vowel shortenings and the early ME. raising or retraction of OE. $\bar{\alpha}$ were known with more certainty. At present, a ME. spelling with a, representing the vowel in question, is usually considered to be derived from an OE. $\bar{\alpha}$ which has been shortened and retracted; while e in most

cases points to an OE. ē-type.

Professor Brandl's investigation * of the boundary between the tense and slack types for OE. all in ME., based on the distribution of the forms Stret- and Strat- (OE. strat) in ME. place-names, gave the following results for the Western and Central Midlands: the line of division between the two types passes along the northern boundary of the counties of Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, thence across the southern part of Warwickshire to the Severn, and down the Severn to the sea, thus excluding Herefordshire from the æ (€)-area. The place-name material which I have collected confirms this view, which is further supported by the evidence of literary texts. In the dialect of Robert of Gloucester, for instance, e for OE. all is certainly slack; the poet rhymes all with [e] (red: ded, "dead"; stret: gret, etc.), and writes a for the shortened form of this vowel (dradde, radde, etc.). Herebert, however (Hereford), rhymes al usually with OE. e (drede: spede, etc.), though once with OE. a2 [e]. Both the Worcester Fragments and Lazamon A distinguish between \bar{a}^1 and \bar{a}^2 , writing e most commonly to represent $\bar{\alpha}^1$, but α for $\bar{\alpha}^2$. Probably, as the boundary given by place-names suggests, the ε-area overlapped the e-area at least in the southern part of Worcestershire, in the Malvern-Pershore area.

(3) OE. \bar{a}^2 (i-mutation of \bar{a}).

OE. \bar{a} was fronted to \bar{a} by *i*-mutation. The vowel \bar{a} (of this origin) remained in the Midlands and in West Saxon until the end of the OE. period. It was raised to $[\bar{e}]$ in the South-East in early OE., and appears as $[\bar{e}]$ in the dialects of that part of the country

[·] Geographie der altenglischen Dialekte, pp. 41 ff.

in ME. A similar OE. raising may have taken place in a small area in Mercia; traces of e for \bar{e}^2 , before point consonants, are found in Rushworth¹ and in the Vespasian Psalter (Bülbring, Elementarbuch, § 167, Anm.; Luick, Hist. Gr., § 268). The ME. evidence for the West Midlands, however, points to a regular slack $[\bar{e}]$ for OE. \bar{e}^2 , thus agreeing with the invariable e for \bar{e}^2 of the OE. West Midland charters.

The usual spelling for $\bar{\alpha}^2$ in ME. is e. Some early texts have more commonly α , and sometimes ea (e.g. Worcs. Fragm., Laz. A). Fourteenth-century texts (Harley Lyrics, Robt. of Glos. and Herebert) have e for OE. $\bar{\alpha}^2$ when long, and a for the same vowel when shortened before a consonant group. Similarly, place-name forms of the West Midlands have Hat- for OE. $h\bar{\alpha}p$, "heath," when followed by another consonant (Shropshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Derbyshire). Het- occurs once in a Warwickshire placename, and once in a form from Derbyshire.

(4) OE. \tilde{y} and \tilde{y} +front consonant (W.Gmc. u-i, j).

OE. \tilde{y} (from $\tilde{u}+-i$, -j) remains in the West Midland dialects all through the OE. period. A few instances of i for y before a front cons. occur in the early Worcestershire charters; these are probably due to the influence of southern scribes. OE. \tilde{y} seems to have remained in ME. in the dialects of the West and Central Midlands. The usual spelling, in place-names and in literary texts, is u; ui,

uy are used sometimes for the long vowel.

The evidence of early forms of place-names indicates that the u-area in the west extended as far north as Lancashire, and that the eastern boundary-line of this area passed through the counties of Derby, Leicester, and Northants. The south-western counties were also within the u-area, but an area of isolative unrounding appears in Devon in early ME., and its influence spreads gradually eastwards in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Unrounding of OE, v before a front cons. is characteristic of the dialects of the South-West (see Wyld, Engl. Stn., 47, p. 6, etc.; Brandl, Geographie, pp. 70 ff. See also English Studies, Dec. 1922). The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth century place-names of the following counties have u for OE. \tilde{y} with very few exceptions: Cheshire, Staffs., Shropshire, Worcs., Warwick, Glos. Lancs. has usually u with some i-forms; Derby has u rather more often than i. The latter county seems to have been a border district between the u and i-areas. The course of the river Derwent probably forms the approximate boundary. Place-names of Herefordshire, Worcs., Shropshire, and Glos. have occasional examples of i before n

(OE. vn), e.g. Kideminstr, etc.

The southern tendency to unround \bar{y} before a front consonant does not seem to have spread into the Midland dialects. The unrounded forms are used in the dialects of Berks, Wilts, and Somerset, but not further north than this; for instance, the thirteenth century Glos. records yield over 70 u-forms (Rugge, -brugge, etc.) to only 3 i-forms, a proportion which is practically negligible.

The West Midland literary texts of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries agree with the place-names in their treatment of OE. \tilde{y} . The Worcs. Fragments have only u; Lazamon A has u with very few *i*-forms, most of which are before -n. The Harley Lyrics, Robt. of Glos., and Herebert have usually u, with i occasionally before -n. All these texts have u almost invariably for \tilde{y} before a front cons. Fifteenth-century texts such as the works of Myrc and Audelay (Shropshire) have a far higher proportion of i-forms than the place-names of the same date. The difference may be due to the spread of literary (London) English.

(5) OE. eo

There is no evidence of the monophthongising of OE. eo in the West Midlands until the second half of the twelfth century, when we find occasional place-name forms with u, ue (e.g. Hurteslega, Hereford, 1158). Lazamon A (c. 1205), though retaining the diphthong in most cases, writes e, u, and o fairly frequently. The retention of the spelling eo in the West Midland texts (until the fourteenth century), and the use of u, ue, and o to express the same sound, indicate that in this dialect OE. to had become a rounded vowel when monophthongised. A similar rounded vowel is characteristic also of the dialects of the South-West and Southern Midlands, west of a line drawn through Dorking and Thame. ME. u, o, and eo for OE. eo are rare in the fourteenth and fifteenth century place-names of Derby, Cheshire, Shropshire, Staffs., and Warwick, though they occur not infrequently in Lancs., Herefordshire, Worcs., and Glos. names of the same period. Further evidence of the existence of a type with rounding in the North-West Midlands in later ME. is furnished by the occasional u-forms in Myrc and Audelay (e.g. bub, OE. beop; duply, OE. deope; furp,

^{*} English Studies, Dec. 1922.

OE. feorda, etc.). Rounded forms are common in the remaining (and earlier) West Midland texts: Worcs. Fragm. have always eo; Lazamon A has eo and u as well as e; Herebert, oe, and also e and eo; Harley Lyrics usually e, but eo and ue are very frequent; u is rare. Robt. of Glos. has e, but u fairly often, eo rarely; Trevisa has about an equal proportion of e and u forms.

We may take it, therefore, that the area in which OE. žo was rounded, and remained rounded, in ME., included Glos., Worcs., Hereford, Shropshire, Cheshire, Staffs., and probably parts of

Lancs., Derby, and Warwick.

(6) OE. žo before r+back consonant.

In certain Midland dialects of OE., all diphthongs were monophthongised before back consonants. This change is known as smoothing (see Luick, Hist. Gr., § 235). Thus OE. ĕo before the groups rc, rg, etc., became e in some dialects, but remained eo in others, including those of the south. We find a distinction, therefore, in western ME., between dialects in which OE. ĕo remained before a back cons., and became u, etc., in ME. (see preceding section, OE, eo), and those dialects in which eo became e before a back cons. in OE. and remained as such in ME. Hence, on the one hand durc, "dark," heorenien, "hearken," etc., and on the other hand derk, herken, etc. All eastern dialects have e in ME. for OE. ĕo+back cons., whether the corresponding OE. dialects had e or eo. Place-name forms without smoothing (Boerc-, Burk-, "birch," etc.) occur in documents from Hants, Berks, and South Oxfordshire. Trevisa (South Glos.) has both e and o (workes, etc., from LWS. worc, earlier weorc). Robt. of Glos., Harl. Lyrics, Herebert, Myrc, and the place-names of North Glos.. North Oxford, and counties north of these have always e. The Worcs. Fragments have deorc once; Lazamon A has usually e, but once weorc, which may be genuine but is not supported by the other evidence.

Normally, then, the West Midland dialects have e for OE. ĕo +back cons., except perhaps in the extreme south of the area

(South Glos.).

(7) OE. & before l+cons.

The greater part, if not the whole, of the West Midlands was outside the area in which OE. \check{a} was fractured to ea before l+cons. in OE. Traces of fracture forms in ME. place-names of Worcs. and Glos. are very rare and doubtful.* Robt. of Glos., Trevisa,

^{*} See Ekwall, OE. Dialects, p. 22, etc.; see also English Studies, June 1922, p. 105.

Herebert, Myrc, and the place-names of Warwick, Hereford, Shropshire, Staffs., etc., have only forms from the unfractured type (ald, cold, bold, calf, etc.). Apparent fracture-forms in the Worcs. Fragm. and Lazamon A (wælde, welden, etc.) are on the analogy of forms with mutation (weldip, wældep, etc.). The five eld-forms (selde, elde adj., etc.) which occur in the Harley Lyrics, are probably survivals from the original dialects of the poems, and do not represent the Herefordshire type. The fracture-type does, however, survive in the thirteenth-fifteenth century place-names of Wilts., Berks., Oxford, and counties to the south of these (Chaldewelle, Chalfle, Eldefeld, etc.).

(8) OE. αl +cons.+-i, -j (unlengthened).

The OE. group al+cons.+-i, -i appears in ME. in four different forms, el, al, ul, il. The two last are from the south-western ie+l (late OE. yl or il), the mutated form of the fracture-diphthong ea+l. ME. el represents the non-WS. mutation of the diphthong ea (from α before $l+\cos l$, or in some cases the mutated form of $\alpha(l)$ without fracture. ME. al represents Prim. OE. al, retracted to al, fronted to al by i-mutation and retracted again to al in ME. The geographical distribution of the four ME. types, il, ul, el, al, as far as this can be determined from place-name forms, has already been investigated by Professor Ekwall (OE. Dialects, pp. 40 ff.). His conclusions, which are based almost entirely on place-names containing the element welle (OE. wielle, welle, etc.), may be summarised thus: il, ul (i.e. wille, wulle) appear in the place-names of the Saxon counties of Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wilts., and Hants., and occasionally in West Sussex, Berks. and Oxford. In the placenames of the last three counties, el is the usual spelling. Al is found in the following West Midland counties: Hereford, Shropshire, Staffs., Cheshire, Lancs., Derbyshire. There are slight traces of this type in Glos., Worcs., and Warwick. In the last three, and all the other English counties-Northern, East Midland, and South-Eastern-el seems to be the typical form.

The place-name material which I have collected, and which consists almost entirely of names in -welle, etc., confirms Professor Ekwall's results. The typical form in the North-West, and perhaps in the Central West Midlands in early ME., is walle. In nearly all the records welle is a common spelling. Since, however, the form walle is restricted to the west, and does not appear in eastern placename forms, we may consider it to be the genuine western dialect

form. The el-type may have occurred, as well as the al-type, in the dialect of some speakers in the West Midlands, or it may have been introduced into the written language by scribes. In either case, welle was probably borrowed from eastern dialects, or possibly from the South-West Midland (e.g. Glos.), where it appears to be the normal form.

In the place-names of Staffs., Shropshire, Cheshire, and Lancs., walle is the predominating form. The Shropshire writer, Myrc, has both el and al. Derbyshire has usually -welle, but -walle is not infrequent, especially in place-names of the west of the county; in the east, towards the borders of Notts. and Leics., -walle is rare. Forms with el are rare in Worcs. place-names, and occur only in early records of North-West Worcs. Lazamon A, also from North-West Worcs., and early thirteenth century, has el, æl, al, etc. The place-names of Hereford have both el and al, the latter chiefly in the thirteenth century; the material is rather scanty. Harley Lyrics have el (al once in rhyme); Herebert has el; these texts are both fourteenth century. It is possible that the al-type was more widespread in Herefordshire in the thirteenth century than later. In Warwickshire, the al-type appears only in field-names; town and village names have regularly -welle, etc. The field-names probably represent an archaic type, surviving from OE. (walle), but no longer current in the normal ME. pronunciation of the county. Robt. of Glos., Trevisa, and the Glos. place-names all have -el; Professor Ekwall found -walle very rarely in Glos. placenames.

On the whole, we may regard the occurrence of al for the i-mutation of al+cons. as a characteristic feature of the dialects of the Central and North-West Midlands in EME., of the North-West Midlands only in later ME.

(9) OE. ear+cons.

OE. ear (<ar+cons.) becomes in ME. either er or ar. The er-type is rare in West Midland texts except in the thirteenth century. Myrc and Herebert have only ar. Trevisa has ar, except for one example of ert, which is perhaps unstressed. Robt. of Glos. has ar except in ern(es), "eagle(s)," and werp, "became" (twice); the vowel in the latter form may be due to the analogy of the Infinitive. The Harley Lyrics have ar usually, but er once: berne, "child"; this may have been confused with OE. beorn, "man." The thirteenth-century Lazamon A has not only ar(20),

but also er(12) and the traditional spellings ear(25) and eer(14). It is possible that both er and ar occurred in the thirteenth century dialect of part of the West Midlands, and that the er-type disappeared fairly early in the spoken dialect. In the East Midland dialect er survived longer. There is considerable fluctuation in the West Midland place-name forms. Some counties seem to retain er until comparatively late; others adopt it first in the thirteenth century; in others, er disappears after the thirteenth century. The material which I have collected is not extensive enough to allow us to draw very definite conclusions.

Thirteenth century: the er-type seems to have obtained in the dialects of the following counties: Lancs., Shropshire, Hereford, North-West Worcs., Glos.; possibly also Warwick, though this is doubtful; also in the southern counties of Berks. and Herts. On the other hand, ar appears in the Midland counties of Derby, Staffs., Leics., Northants., Beds., Oxford, Worcs. (south and east).

Fourteenth century: the er-type is found in Lancs. and in Derbyshire; both have ar as well as er. The southern counties of Berks. and Herts. also have er, but er seems to have disappeared in the dialects of Glos., Hereford, and Shropshire. The ar-counties comprise those whose dialects had ar in the thirteenth century, with the addition of Glos., Hereford, Shropshire, Cheshire, and Warwick. Thus practically the whole of the West and Central Midlands have ar in the fourteenth century.

Fifteenth century: er still survives in the dialects of Berks. and Herts. Solitary er-forms in Notts. and Staffs. are doubtful. Derby has a few er-forms. In this century er appears in Beds. With these exceptions, ar is the only form in the West and Central

Midlands.

(10) OE. a+nasal (unlengthened).

OE. a+nasal appears in ME. as an, am, or on, om (e.g. man, can, name; mon, con, nome). The type with a is by far the most common and is current over the whole of the Central and East Midlands and South-East—except, perhaps, for a small area represented by the Lambeth Homilies and a few other texts. The South Midland dialects, as shown by the place-names of Oxford and Bucks., had the an-type.

In the dialects of the West Midlands the characteristic form is

[•] Forms with on in East Midland texts are very rare; see Menner, in Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America, 37, p. 510.

on, om. The literary texts of the Central West and North-West Midlands (twelfth-fifteenth century) have on, om, as the only or the predominating form. The evidence of the place-names supports that of these texts; Cheshire, Staffs., Worcs., Hereford, and Shropshire have on (the material is not extensive); Lancs. has both types, an predominating in the thirteenth century, on in the fourteenth. Derby and Warwick, which have both on and an forms, lie apparently on the border between the eastern and central an-area and the western on. The late ME. Coventry Leet Book, which is strongly influenced by London English, has an both in place-names and in independent words; on is very rare.

The on-type was current in the dialect of the South-West Midlands in early ME., for the Glos. place-names of the thirteenth century have nearly always on. On the other hand, the Glos. literary texts of the fourteenth century (Robt. of Glos. and Trevisa) have normally an; place-names illustrating this point are very rare in the fourteenth century, but both an and on are used. The an-type apparently spread into Glos., from the south, towards the

end of the thirteenth century.

(11) OE. ēa+-i, -j.

OE. ēa (W.Gmc. au) and OE. ĕa (from æ by fracture before r+cons., etc.) were mutated to \tilde{e} by a following i or j in most of the dialects of OE. In West Saxon alone, the diphthong ea became ie before i, j. In some West Saxon dialects ie was monophthongised to i in EWS.; in others, ie remained until late OE., when it was rounded to \tilde{v} ; the corresponding ME. forms are \tilde{t} and \tilde{u} [\tilde{v}] respectively. The ie-type seems to have been confined to the dialects of Glos, and the counties south of the Thames, excluding Kent, Surrey, and Sussex.* The geographical limits of the late OE. variants of this type—i and y—are more difficult to determine. The ME. boundary between the \tilde{e} and \tilde{u}/\tilde{i} types is approximately the same as the OE. boundary. That is to say, the greater part of the West Midlands lies within the e-area. The place-names of Worcs., Shropshire, and Warwick have only e; so also have the following literary texts: Worcs. Fragments, Harley Lyrics, Herebert, Myrc. A very few u and i forms occur in Lazamon A (hure, ihire, biliued, etc.), though e is normal.

Glos. differs from the rest of the West Midlands in having the south-western u or i type. The ME. place-names have i (thirteenth

[·] See English Studies, Oct. 1922, p. 191.

century) and e (fifteenth century); Robt. of Glos. (early fourteenth century) has u in hure, "hear" (rhymes with AN. dure, "to last," etc.), hurde, etc., but e in derne, yflemd, leue, etc. Trevisa (late fourteenth century, and rather more southern) has usually u: hurde, hurynge, wurne, "refuse," etc.; the i-type occurs in hyre, lyze, "flame"; the e-type is very rare.

(12) OE. ēag, ēah.

By the end of the OE. period, $\bar{e}ag$, $\bar{e}ah$ had become $\bar{e}g$, $\bar{e}h$ (with a tense \bar{e}) in all dialects (Luick, Hist. Gr., § 278; Bülbring, Elementarbuch, §§ 200, 317, 318). These groups appear in EME. as $\bar{e}z$, $\bar{e}h$. EME. tense \bar{e} was diphthongised in most dialects before z, h [j, χ], e.g. heize, heih, "high"; eize, "eye"; neih, "near," etc. Some speakers may have preserved the tense \bar{e} before h, whence such forms as heh, neh, leh, etc. In many dialects, especially of the Central Midlands and Central South, during the course of the thirteenth century, $\bar{e}i$ before z, h, was raised to \bar{i} . Spellings such as hye, hih, "high"; ye, "eye," etc., become increasingly common in late ME. texts, though in many cases the traditional spelling ey, etc., remains. We have, therefore, in ME., (1) $\bar{e}iz$ from OE. $\bar{e}ag$; (2) $\bar{e}ih$, or (3) $\bar{e}h$ from OE. $\bar{e}ah$, (4) i from EME. $\bar{e}iz$, $\bar{e}ih$; and also (5) \bar{e} from OE. $\bar{e}a$ in inflected cases, e.g. h $\bar{e}a$, l $\bar{e}a$, in which the -h-was lost between vowels (*heaha).

The most important of these varieties as a test of dialect is No. (4)—the raising of \bar{e}_3 to \bar{i} . An examination of early forms of place-names containing the elements $h\bar{e}ah$, "high," $l\bar{e}ah$, "meadow," shows that whereas the records of certain counties, from the thirteenth century onwards, have a fair number of i-spellings, in other districts \bar{i} (for OE. $\bar{e}ag$, $\bar{e}ah$) does not occur at all. Spellings with i are nowhere very common, and the test cannot be said at present to be thoroughly reliable; but it seems natural to assign a text which has no i-forms to an area whose place-names show no i-forms, rather than to a county in whose records i-spellings do occur, though perhaps rarely.

The prevailing type in the place-names of the West Midlands is the diphthongal form ei. This is the usual spelling in Lancs., Derby, Staffs., Shropshire, Hereford, Worcs., Warwick, Glos. Cheshire, on the other hand, has egh as a rule. The same type is fairly common in the place-names of Staffs., Shropshire, and Worcs.

In all the West Midland counties, e occurs occasionally.

Place-name forms with i-spellings (Hih-, Hy, Lye, Ligh-, -lye,

The evidence of the Herefordshire place-names (a few *i*-forms) is not corroborated by that of the *Harley Lyrics* and Herebert. The former have apparently always *ey*, *eh*. Herebert also has *ey*. The *i*-forms in the place-names occur only in the Episcopal Registers,

and it is possible that they were introduced by scribes.

Myrc and Audelay have both ei and i. It is rather surprising that the thirteenth-century Shropshire place-names have a few i-forms, the fourteenth and fifteenth century records none at all.

It appears, then, that the counties in whose records *i*-forms occur earliest and most frequently are Derby, Staffs., Warwick, and Shropshire; in the dialects of these counties the *i*-type probably developed in EME. The older forms with *ei* or *eh* survived in ME. in the dialects of Glos., Hereford, Cheshire, and Lancs., though the *i*-type may have spread into some of these areas—certainly into Glos.—in late ME., from adjoining districts.

(13) Ending of Infinitive.

- (a) South-West Midland (Glos.). The usual ending in the fourteenth-century texts is -e (Robt. of Glos., Trevisa). The ending -i is fairly common in the first half of the fourteenth century, in French verbs and OE. weak verbs of the 2nd class. This class of verbs often has -ie, and sometimes -e, instead of -i. By the end of the fourteenth century, the -i- in these weak verbs seems to have been lost.
- (b) Central West Midlands (Hereford, Worcs.). The twelfth and thirteenth century texts have -en (Worcs. Fragm., Lazamon A).

In the fourteenth century -e is usual (Harley Lyrics and Herebert), but -en is used fairly often. The -i- of OE. -ian verbs is usually retained in the thirteenth-century dialect, but is often lost in that

of the fourteenth century.

(c) North-West Midlands (Shropshire, Lancs., Cheshire, etc.). The ending -e is normal, but -en occurs occasionally, and forms without ending are not infrequent (Myrc; Lancs., Cheshire, and Staffs. deeds, etc.). The weak verbs of the 2nd class do not retain the vowel -i-.

(14) Present Participle.

The typical forms of the ending of the Present Participle in Eastern England in Early Middle English are the following: (a) -ind in the South-East, up to and including London; (b) -end in the East Midlands proper; (c) -and in North Norfolk and beyond (Yorks., Lincs., etc.).* In the West Midland texts and field-names we find, as in the East Midlands, three participial endings: -ind, -end, -and. The ending -end is rarer in the West than in the East Midlands, and it does not seem possible to prove definitely the existence of a Western dialect area in which the typical form for the Present Participle was -end. Robt. of Glos. has -inde, berninde, etc.; three examples of -ing occur in this text: ligginge, etc. Trevisa, half a century later, has only the modern ending ing: passynge, etc. I have noted one Glos, field-name with -inde: Hangindelonde (Glos. Cart., thirteenth century). The typical form in the Herefordshire dialect seems to be -inde. The Harley Lyrics have only this ending. Herebert, however, has only -ing. The twelfth-century Worcs. Fragments have -inde in weopinde, -ende in the OE. -ian verb woniende. Lazamon A has -inde, and -ende rather less often; many of the latter forms are participles of OE. verbs of the 2nd class of weak verbs: fuliende, wuniende, etc. Five examples of -ing occur in Lazamon A: berninge, etc. The early ME. dialect of Warwickshire apparently had -inde in the Pres. Part. This type appears in place-names: Hongindelond, le Fallyndedoune, etc., all from the southern half of the county. I have noted two examples of Present Participles in -ande in Derbyshire place-names: Renyandesyke, Stinkandesike (Dale Cart.); a fifteenth-century Derbyshire deed has only -ing. The name Sellandefelde occurs in a Lichfield (Staffs.) document of 1535. Though the form is late, it is probably a genuine survival of an archaic type. In Shropshire,

[•] Wyld, South-East and South-East Midland Dialects, pp. 121, 127.

Myrc has only -ing, Audelay both -ande and -ing. Field-names, etc., with -ande, more rarely -ende, occur in Lancs. documents: Standand-Stone; Prof. Menner finds the ending -ande even in

fifteenth-century Lancs. deeds (P.M.L.A. 37, p. 524).

We may summarise the last paragraph thus: the Pres. Part. ends in -inde in the ME. dialects of Hereford, Worcs., South Warwick, and Glos. The form -ende occurs sometimes in the thirteenth-century texts, usually in the participles of OE. verbs in -ian (<-*ojan). The Pres. Part. ends in -ande in the ME. dialects of Derby, Staffs., Shropshire, Lancs., and presumably also, from its position between Lancs. and Shropshire, in the dialect of Cheshire.

(15) Past Participle.

The typical form of the P.P. in the South-West Midland dialect, as in those of the south generally, is i . . . e. Robt. of Glos, has the prefix almost invariably; the -n of the ending is always lost. Trevisa and fifteenth-century wills, etc., have regularly y . . . e. The earlier texts of the Central West Midlands have i . . . en. Lazamon A has very rarely forms without i- or without -n. In the fourteenth century texts the i- prefix is often omitted, especially in the Harley Lyrics, which are rather more northerly than the poems of Herebert; i- is rare in fifteenth-century deeds; in all these Hereford documents, the proportion of -e to -en endings is about 3 to 1. Audelay has i- occasionally in the P.P.; Myrc has i- fairly often; the proportion of -en to -e in the P.P. suffix is rather higher in the Shropshire texts than in those of Herefordshire. The ending -en is regular in the dialects of Lancs., Cheshire, Derby, Staffs.; but -e is found sometimes in Staffs., and Prof. Menner has noted at least one example from Cheshire (P.M.L.A. 37, p. 524).

(16) Ending of the 3rd Singular Present Indicative.

The two endings which appear in ME. texts for the 3rd Sing. Pres. are -ed and -es. The latter is considered to be a characteristic of Northern English. The ending -es is found in the East Midland dialects as far south as Lincolnshire and Norfolk; * farther south, -ep is the usual form, though -es occurs sporadically in a few texts.

The usual ending for the 3rd Sing. Pres. in the South and Central West Midlands is -ed. This type appears in the Worcs. Fragm., Lazamon A, Robt. of Glos., Herebert, Trevisa. The 3rd Sing. generally ends in -eth in the Harley Lyrics, but -es occurs

[.] Wyld, South-East and South-East Midland Dialects, p. 119.

also (19 times): deles, drynkes, etc. Eight of these examples with -es are in rhyme, and therefore belong to the dialect of the author and not necessarily to that of the scribe; it is possible that the remaining -es forms are also survivals from the original dialects of the poems; they can hardly be taken as proof of the existence of the ending -es in the 3rd Sing. in the Centr.W.Midl. dialect at this period. A few -es forms occur in fourteenth and fifteenth century documents from the South-West, and from the South-West Midlands. Thus, Robt. of Glos. has me penches, and as "has." Such forms are probably examples of the modern 3rd Sing. in -s.

In the North-West Midlands, Audelay has usually -ys, but uses the ending -eth, (-id), occasionally. In Myrc, the -es forms are rarer. The ending -s is normal in fifteenth-century deeds from Lancs., Cheshire, Derby, and North Staffs. South Staffs. deeds,

however, have -eth.

We shall probably be not very far wrong if we take a line drawn from Yarmouth to the source of the Severn as the approximate southern boundary of -es forms as a feature of regional dialect.

(17) Plural of Present Indicative.

The usual ending of the Pres. Plural in the dialects of Glos., Worcs., and Hereford is -eõ (Worcs. Fragm., Lazamon A, Harley Lyrics, Robt. of Glos., Herebert, Trevisa). Harley Lyrics have -en occasionally; Herebert has -e once (in rhyme: kalle; alle). Robt.

of Glos. has one example of -es: destruyes, 2835.

Audelay and Myrc have -en, -es, -ep. The last is especially common in Myrc's *Instructions*; it is rare in the *Festial*. The ending -es does not seem to be used for the plural in the *Festial*, and I have noted only two examples of it in the *Instructions*. Audelay does not use -es very often. The Pres. Ind. Plural ends in -en or -e, rarely -s, in Lancs., Cheshire, Derby, and Staffs. deeds of the fifteenth century.

(18) The Plural of the Verb " to be."

The form be(o)p was used in the dialects of Hereford, Worcs., and Glos. until the fifteenth century, when it was replaced by ben, etc. The latter type may have been in use in the Hereford dialect already in the fourteenth century, by the side of bep. Shropshire has ben, beth, and occasional ar. Cheshire has both ben and arn; Staffs. probably agreed with Cheshire. The dialects of Lancs. and Derby apparently had the form ar.

The forms used in the individual texts are as follows: the

southern be(o) b is used in the dialects of Robt. of Glos. (beb), Trevisa (bep), Lazamon A (beop, bep), Worcs. Fragments (beod), Harley Lyrics (buep, bep, etc.; also buen, ben, aren), Herebert (bueb, boeb, etc.). The form be(o)n is found in Myrc (by the side of beth). The Harley Lyrics have buen, ben, occasionally, though usually bueb, etc. The -n type occurs also in fifteenth-century Herefordshire deeds. Are, aren, appear rarely in the Harley Lyrics; Myrc and Audelay have ar, aren occasionally. This type occurs also in a Derbyshire deed of 1439 (are). A Cheshire deed of 1426 (Cat. Anc. Dds. IV) has both arne and ben. An English deed (1363) in the Cockersand Cartulary has ar, and also the unstressed forms, er, ere.

(19) Feminine Singular Pronoun.

The West Midland dialects of ME, usually have, for the Nominative of the feminine pronoun, a form derived from the OE. Nom. hēo, hīo, whereas the dialects of the East Midlands and North adopt early in ME. the new forms she, sho; these, except for two isolated examples in Robt. of Glos., do not occur in the West Midlands until the fifteenth century. The most common form in the Central West and South-West Midlands is heo, also hue in the fourteenth century; the North-West Midland texts of the fifteenth century have ho, sometimes also scho,

Heo. This is the usual form in the following texts: Lazamon A,

Harley Lyrics, Robt. of Glos., Myrc, Audelay.

Hue. The normal development of the diphthong eo in the West Midlands is expressed by the spelling ue. Hue is common in some fourteenth-century texts (e.g. Trevisa and the Harley Lyrics).

Ho. The form ho [ho] probably indicates a pronunciation with the stress shifted in Late OE, to the second element of the diphthong. The pronoun ho occurs most commonly in Myrc, that is, in the North-West Midlands.* A similar development is found in Robt. of Glos., who, by the side of the usual heo, has also 30, apparently $[\chi \bar{o}]$. The earliest instance of the use of ho seems to be in Lazamon A, which has ho once. It occurs once also in the Harley Lyrics.

He. The form he is written fairly often in the Harley Lyrics. Otherwise it is rare in the West Midlands until the fifteenth century, when it is found in Audelay's poems. Robt. of Glos. has he, ze,

very rarely.

^{*} Note the form hoo-wolf, " she-wolf," Myrc : Festial, p. 210.

She, sho. The forms sse, sso, occur once each in Robt. of Glos. There are no traces of this type in Lazamon A, Harley Lyrics, Trevisa. Audelay has shee as well as he and heo. Myrc's Instructions has six instances of scho to fourteen of heo and six of ho.

Both the Genitive and Dative of the fem. sing. pronoun are usually hire or hyre in the West Midland texts. Lazamon A has hir (once heore); the Harley Lyrics, hire, hyr(e), (once here); Robt. of Glos., (h)ire, rarely here; Myrc, (Instr.) hyre. The form here is used chiefly in late fourteenth century and fifteenth century texts: Trevisa, and the fifteenth-century wills.

(20) The Plural Pronoun of the Third Person.

One of the leading characteristics of the Western dialects of ME. is the frequent occurrence of heore, hore, heom, hom, for the Gen. and Dat. of the plural pron. of the 3rd person, whereas the Eastern dialects have regularly her and hem, except in a few twelfth-century texts in which heom occurs by the side of hem. The native English pronouns he, hi, here, hem, were gradually ousted in ME. by the Scandinavian pey, peirr, peim. The Nom. pey, pay, is common in ME. in North-East and North-West Midland texts; it is found even in the South-East Midlands by the end of the fourteenth century. The Gen. and Dat. forms with p- are rare until the fifteenth century, except in Northern English.

The Nom. of the plural pron. is hii in Robt. of Glos., hy in Trevisa. Robt. of Glos. has usually Gen. hor(e), Dat. hom. Here and hem (zem), are very rare in this text, as is also the unstressed Dat. zam; Gen. hare and hire occur once each in 11. 1-6000.

Trevisa has here, hem, regularly for the Gen. and Dat.

The Nom. is usually heo in the EME. dialects of the Central West Midlands. This form is used in the Worcs. Fragm. and Lazamon (also he once, hi twice, in the latter). In the fourteenth century we find hue and he as well as heo. The Harley Lyrics have not only hue, heo, and he(e), but also hi(i), hy, and sometimes pey. Herebert has hoe.

The Genitive of the plural pron. in Lazamon is heore; here occurs twice and hora once. The Worcs. Fragm. have hore, heore; Harley Lyrics, huere, also heore, here, occasionally; Herebert, hoere, here. The Dative is usually heom in Lazamon; this text has very rarely hem, hom, and the unstressed ham. The Worcs. Fragm.

[•] Trevisa also has the unstressed a.

have both ham and heom. The unrounded hem is more common than huem in the Harley Lyrics. Herebert has hoem and hom.

In the North-West Midlands, the regular form of the Nom. is pey, thai, etc. The Genitive is here in Myrc's Instructions, but usually hor (also her, hur) in the Festial. The Dat. is hem in the Instr., hom and hem in the Festial. Audelay has not only hure, but also her and per; Dative, ham and payme. An English deed of 1363 in the Cockersand Cartulary has always theyr(r), theym(e), and the unstressed ther and theme. A fifteenth-century Cheshire deed has thair and thayres, and both thaym and hom. The forms hor (beside ther) and home occur in a deed relating to North Staffs. and Derby (1446).

To sum up the preceding paragraphs: the South-West Midlands have normally hi: heore, hore; heom, hom; the Central West Midlands, heo; h(e)ore; h(e)om, but pey in the fifteenth century; the North-West Midlands have pey: hor, here; hom, hem; theyr and theym occur in Lancs., Cheshire, and Shropshire in Late ME.

(To be concluded.)

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

SHADWELL AND THE OPERATIC TEMPEST

THE passage which Mr. D. M. Walmsley quotes * from my note on Dryden and the Opera on The Tempest † might perhaps have struck him as somewhat less curious if he had had in mind the precise point which I ventured to think open to doubt, viz. whether Shadwell, or any one else, found The Tempest, after Davenant and Dryden had ceased to deal with it, still essentially a comedy and made it into an opera, or, to adopt Mr. W. J. Lawrence's question, "Did Thomas

Shadwell write an Opera on The Tempest?"

If one were concerned with Mr. Walmsley's view of the matter, it might not be irrelevant to point out that his admission I that "the 1670 Tempest has certain distinctive operatic features" seems, to say the least of it, to betray a looseness of language on the part of any one who maintains that that was at some specific date made into an opera which already possessed some of the distinctive features of one. In case I may have been unfortunate enough to mislead any one else, may I be permitted to say that the proposition I intended to submit for consideration was that Shadwell did not make The Tempest into an opera, because before and apart from the insertion of anything of his into it, even if he was ever a party to any such insertion, it was already an opera and was recognised as such by, among others, Dryden himself? It is therefore merely begging the question to say, as Mr. Walmsley does, that a passage in the Epistle to the Reader before Ravenscroft's The Careless Lovers was not intended to allude to the operatic Tempest, because Ravenscroft's play was published in 1673, "whereas the opera was not produced until c. April 30, 1674. § It would have helped the discussion a great deal more if Mr. Walmsley had told us to what this and some of the other passages quoted were intended to allude.

[•] R.E.S., ii. 463. † Ibid., ii. 464 and note.

[†] Ibid., i. 328. § Ibid., ii. 463-4.

The point, such as it is, that it is sought to establish from the appearance of the 1670 text in the Folio of 1701 depends entirely upon the assumption that Dryden, indifferent to the previous collections of his Works, was responsible for the contents of that of 1701. "This fact," i.e. this appearance, under Dryden's supervision, of the text of the 1670 Tempest, nullifies, it is said, any relevant inference that might be drawn from the circumstance that Dryden, desirous that intending purchasers of his Works should not be imposed upon by the insertion among them of something that was not his, had in 1692 included The Tempest in an authoritative list, when the 1670 edition of it had been long out of print, and the only text available was that of 1674, which had then recently been reprinted and which appeared in the collected editions dated 1691, 1693, and 1695.

This alleged "fact" is arrived at in the following simple and ingenuous manner. There is no reason, it is said, to suppose that Dryden authorised a collection of his Works which was published during his life and which happens to include the 1674 Tempest, but it is reasonable to assume that he supervised the editing of another edition of them which prints the 1670 text and which appeared twelve months after his death. Many arguments, one takes leave to think, might be nullified by a similar process of reasoning.

There is not a tittle of evidence to lead any one to suppose that Dryden had anything whatever to do with the 1701 Folio, or that he even knew that such a publication was contemplated, and he who will take the trouble to collate two or three of the plays as they therein appear will easily be able to satisfy himself that the idea that they had passed under the author's eye is preposterous.

The next collected edition, known as Congreve's, and published, like the Folio, by Tonson, appeared in 1717. It was Congreve to whom, as he repeats in his Dedication, Dryden had recommended it to be kind to his Remains: he, if any one, would have known if there was any ground for supposing that the author had supervised the editing of the Folio, the obvious starting-point of any succeeding editor, and he, if any such ground existed, would have been the last to disregard the directions of his departed Friend. Though, as far as I am aware, the edition of 1717 substantially reproduces the contents of the Folio, there is one notable exception, The Tempest, in the case of which the text of 1674 has been substituted for that of 1670.

So far am I from suggesting that Dryden was incapable of providing words for music (Mr. Walmsley talks * about providing "vocal music," but I suppose he does not really mean that) and other operatic features, that I have been trying to show that he provided or assisted to provide both for *The Tempest*, and, as I have pointed out above, it does not advance the matter in the least to assume the conclusion, and then to found upon it an argument for the purpose of proving it.

The whole point of the quotations from the Preface before Albion and Albanius, which Mr. Walmsley seems entirely to miss, is that in them Dryden is discussing opera and nothing else, and is introducing The Tempest as a successful example of that class of

composition.

The question is not whether Shadwell had any particular desire to advertise the fact that he had made "only an elaborated stage version of the Dryden-D'Avenant play," but whether he had any conceivable motive for concealing and inducing others to assist in concealing the fact that he had, with conspicuous financial success, made their comedy into an opera, or written an opera on The Tempest; if he and others had no such motive, then the ignorance of contemporary writers who dealt with stage matters points, in my submission, to one conclusion only.

That portion of the Epilogue to The Armenian Queen which refers to The Tempest was printed in The Shakespere Allusion Book,† and is, I suppose, familiar to those who are interested in such matters. If Shadwell was nicknamed "Punch" and was reduced to preparing Drolls for Bartholomew Fair, to Mr. Walmsley belongs the credit of discovering these interesting circumstances in his biography, circumstances which would have been eagerly seized upon by some of his contemporaries, but to which, for some reason or other, there is no allusion in the abuse of him which any of them published. Who, may one ask, is "Miss Punch" who appears a little lower down in the Epilogue?

I hope no one will suppose that I am seriously suggesting that Dryden was attached to a Puppet-show or that "Punch" was his nickname, but if it is one which might well have been applied to Shadwell, might it not with even more propriety have been applied

[•] R.E.S., ii. 464.

† And afterwards, I regret to say at my instance, in Notes and Queries, as I did not recognise that Duffett and P. W. Gent. were one.

to him who, as everybody knows, was called "Squab" because of his figure, and who was made to say of himself, "But I hope ere long I shall have drawn this pampered paunch fitter for the straight gate " ? *

As I have before suggested, The Tempest of Dryden and Davenant was, in my view, revived from time to time with what were claimed to be fresh attractions in the way of Scenes, or Machines, or Songs or Dances, or perhaps of all of them. It is impossible to say when such revivals began, but there is, I believe, reason to think that it

was at some time considerably before April 1674.

Downes, speaking of The Jealous Bridegroom, "wrote by Mrs. Bhen " (sic), describes it as "a good play" and says that "it lasted six days; but this made its exit too, to give room for a greater, The Tempest." † Now The Forc'd Marriage, or The Jealous Bridegroom was produced, according to Mr. Nicoll's Restoration Drama, in November (p. 130) or December (p. 352) 1670, and though Downes may again be wrong about the date (he seems to assign the production of Mrs. Behn's play to 1672), he ought to be accurate about such an unusual circumstance as this. Anybody is, of course, at liberty to believe, if he chooses, that the successful run of this piece was interrupted to make room for a revival of The Tempest as it had been played ever since 1667 and as it appears in the 1670 4to, but it is, I think, infinitely more probable that we have here evidence of the production of such an "improved version" as I have suggested. Assuming that a new version was produced in or about April 1674, which I must not be taken to admit, what is there to show that at that particular date The Tempest made its appearance in a character radically differing from that which it bears in the 1670 4th or, in other words, that it was then any nearer to Dryden's definition of an opera than it had been before? Let us look for a moment at its immediately succeeding history; it has struck Mr. Allardyce Nicoll as interesting that double prices were still being charged even after more than six months had elapsed, i.e. from the date which he takes to have been that of its original production as an opera. Mr. Nicoll's observation I is prompted by the fact that he finds from the Lord Chamberlain's records that the Court attended performances of The Tempest on November 17, 18, and 28, 1674, and that a charge of

^{*} The Hind and the Panther Transvers'd . . . (1687), 4°, p. 3.

[†] Roscius Anglicanus, ed. Waldron, 43. † Times Literary Supplement, September 21, 1922.

£20 was made for each of them. I should have thought, with all deference, that the fact that the Court saw the opera on two consecutive occasions and three times in twelve days was of even greater interest and significance, and that it pointed to yet another revival with what were, no doubt, advertised as novel attractions. Later (the exact date is unknown but it is thought to have been in 1692), Purcell composed music for additional songs in *The Tempest*, and though Mr. Walmsley asserts that the 1674 version was that which was being used on the stage in 1701, I should think it extremely improbable that the Purcell additions had then been abandoned.

G. THORN-DRURY.

A COPY OF SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS WHICH FORMERLY BELONGED TO DR. JOHNSON.*

THERE is a very interesting copy of Shakespeare, formerly owned by Dr. Johnson and now in the library of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, to which it came among the books of George E. J. Powell (1842–82) of Nant-Eos, Cardiganshire. A few notes on this work may be of interest to students of Johnson.

The description of the work is as follows:

The works of Shakespear . . . with a comment and notes . . . By Mr. Pope and Mr. Warburton . . . Lond., J. and P. Knapton [etc.], 1747. 8 vols. 21½×13 cm. Portr.

The volumes are bound in half leather with marbled boards. They are in very fair condition.

All the volumes except vol. 6 contain notes in the handwriting of Dr. Johnson. With unimportant exceptions these notes are of two kinds:

(1) Numerous words in the text are underlined and large initial letters are entered in the margins. Occasionally two words are underlined and double initials are entered, e.g. "Bo" to represent "broke out," "Wo" to represent "whet on." These initials are crossed through, generally several times. Sometimes, again, a

[•] I am greatly indebted in what follows to Mr. L. F. Powell of the Taylor Institution, Oxford, and to my colleague in the library of the University College of Wales, Miss E. M. Harris.

whole word is entered in the margin, if its spelling differed from that of the text: I give a few instances.*

High Queen of state, Great Juno, comes; I know her by her gate.

Tempest, IV. i.

Here Johnson has underlined "gate," but entered the word in the margin as "gait" to indicate that he wished it to be dealt with under that spelling.

First rehearse this song by roat.

Midsummer Night's Dream, v. ii.

The word "roat" is underlined, but is entered in the margin as "rote."

Gracing the scroul, that tells of this war's loss.

King John, II. i.

"Scroul" is underlined, but entered as "scroll."

These notes are in pencil.

(2) In a few places there are more elaborate notes, comments or variant readings, almost always in pencil.

The notes of the first kind show that this copy of Shakespeare was among the books used by Dr. Johnson in compiling his Dictionary. In his Preface to the Dictionary Johnson describes his labours in collecting instances of the use of words from all departments of English literature. These instances were afterwards reduced to alphabetical order.

Boswell in the Life describes Johnson's method of work as follows:

The words, partly taken from other dictionaries, and partly supplied by himself, having been first written down with spaces left between them, he delivered in writing their etymologies, definitions, and various significations. The authorities were copied from the books themselves, in which he had marked the passages with a black-lead pencil, the traces of which could easily be effaced. I have seen several of them, in which that trouble had not been taken; so that they were just as when used by the copyists.

Bishop Percy has left an important correction of this account:

The account of the manner in which Johnson compiled his Dictionary, as given by Mr. Boswell, is confused and erroneous. . . . Johnson . . . devised the following mode for completing his Dictionary, as he himself expressly described to the writer of this account. He began his task by devoting his first care to a diligent perusal of all such English writers as

References to Acts and Scenes are to the Oxford Shakespeare, ed. by W. J. Craig, the text is from this 1747 edition. These instances appear in Johnson's Dictionary with the spelling duly altered.

were most correct in their language, and under every sentence which he meant to quote, he drew a line, and noted in the margin the first letter of the word under which it was to occur. He then delivered these books to his clerks, who transcribed each sentence on a separate slip of paper, and arranged the same under the word referred to. By these means he collected the several words and their different significations; and when the whole arrangement was alphabetically formed, he gave the definitions of their meanings, and collected their etymologies from Skinner, Junius, and other writers on the subject.*

Except for the fact that single words (or sometimes two words), not sentences, are underlined in these volumes, Bishop Percy's account is admirably illustrated by the notes in this copy of Shakespeare. The crossing through of the initial letters was probably done by one of the copyists to show that he had duly transcribed the item. From the appearance of these volumes it is easy to believe that Johnson had to reduce his accumulation of instances: in the play King Henry IV., pt. 2, which I selected as occurring in vol. 4, I have counted 126 items marked for copying in Act I. only.†

In the case of the more elaborate notes I have compared all the important ones with Johnson's edition of Shakespeare, 1765. Some have been used and some not. I give a few instances.†

. . . then if you know,
That you are well acquainted with yourself.
All's Well, v. iii.

Against this passage Johnson has written: "Then if you have any consciousness of your own actions." In his edition a note appears as follows: "The true meaning of this strange expression is, If you know that your faculties are so sound, as that you have the proper consciousness of your own actions, and are able to recollect and relate what you have done, tell me, etc." [The italics are Johnson's.]

Again:

Thus, like the formal vice, Iniquity, I moralise: Two Meanings in one word.

Richard III., III. i.

Craig, the text is from Johnson's edition of Shakespeare, 1765.

[•] See Anderson, Robert, Life of Samuel Johnson, 3rd ed. 1815. Anderson gives (pp. 115-17) the substance of Boswell's account of Johnson's method, and then gives the above correction of it in a note signed "Bishop Percy."

then gives the above correction of it in a note signed "Bishop Percy."

† "When the time called upon me to range this accumulation of elegance and wisdom into an alphabetical series, I soon discovered that the bulk of my volumes would fright away the student" (Johnson's Preface to the Dictionary).

‡ References to Acts and Scenes are to the Oxford Shakespeare, ed. by W.J.

Warburton has two notes on this passage, one a footnote and one at the end of the play. At the beginning of the latter is written in Johnson's hand: "I shall here subjoin two dissertations, one by Dr. Warburton, and one by Mr. Upton upon the Vice, though I think the question not very important." In Johnson's edition he introduces Warburton's note with these words, omitting "though I think the question not very important." Similarly, at the end of this note of Warburton's, Johnson has written: "To this when Mr. Upton's dissertation is subjoined, there will perhaps be no need of any other account of the vice." These words also appear in Johnson's edition.

On the other hand, in the case of the following passage:

The quarrel is between our masters, and us their men.

Romeo and Juliet, 1. i.;

although Johnson has noted: "Read, and not us their men," he made no use of the correction and Warburton's reading is kept.

To deal now with vol. 6, which was expressly excluded from the foregoing description, this volume, as regards MS. notes, presents an entirely different appearance. There are no notes by Johnson in it, nor even initial letters. On a flyleaf which is now pasted in but is of paper similar to other flyleaves in this volume is the following MS. note: "Macbeth—P. 375. L. 4. Come Fate into the List—I should think it was into the Lists.—E.W." The remainder of the volume is copiously annotated in a different hand: the writing, which is in ink, is small and thin and inclined slightly forward. Many of the notes are variant readings.

It is, I think, certain that the numerous annotations in this volume are by Styan Thirlby, whereas the "E.W." who signs the note on the flyleaf is Sir Edward Walpole (d. 1784), an elder brother of Horace Walpole. Thirlby possessed a copy of Warburton's Shakespeare with annotations which he had intended for a projected edition of his own. "The copy became the property of Sir Edward Walpole, to whom Thirlby bequeathed all his books and papers. Walpole lent it to Dr. Johnson when he was preparing his edition of Shakespeare, in which the name of Thirlby appears as a commentator." It would seem that Johnson neglected to return vol. 6 of this copy to Sir Edward Walpole and completed his own set by means of it, possibly thereby replacing a lost volume though

[.] Dict. of Nat. Biogr., art. Thirlby.

of this one cannot be sure. It is however possible to trace most of the subsequent history of Johnson's set. It appears as lot 131 "Warburton's Shakespeare, 8v." in the sale catalogue of Johnson's library. A MS. note in vol. 1 shows that the set passed into the possession of George Steevens,* and it appears as lot 1328 in the catalogue of the Steevens sale, where it was bought for £1 by a certain Stace. In Heber's sale catalogue, pt. 1, it appears as lot 6325, and the preceding item is Thirlby's copy, "wanting vol. 6." MS. notes give the sale prices of the two copies as £6 for Thirlby's and £13 13s. for Johnson's set.† Johnson's volumes also belonged at one time to a gentleman named Charles Thoyts, whose bookplate appears in all eight of them. Lastly, George E. J. Powell, who owned the books before they came to the University College of Wales, notes that he purchased them of Nattali and Bond for £15 15s. in 1862.

A. CUMING.

THE CANON OF SWIFT

UNTIL further and convincing evidence comes to light, the authorship of Jack Frenchman's Lamentation cannot be more than a measuring of probabilities. In a note I contributed to this Review in July of last year I stated the case for Swift, after discovering a copy of the ballad published by Morphew; and I am pleased to find that Sir Charles Firth considers that the discovery "increases the probability" for the attribution originally suggested by Sir Walter Scott. It is true that no contemporary attribution to Swift has been found; and, contrariwise, Lady Cowper, in her diary, assigns the ballad to Congreve. On the strength of this attribution Dr. Elrington Ball (Notes and Queries, 12 S. viii. 301, 302) supposes Congreve to be the author of several other ballads written in the same metre, common as that stanza form was at the time. But, although I hesitate to question an opinion expressed by Dr. Ball, I cannot feel that anything undoubtedly by Congreve betrays a likeness to the racy ease and irregularity of Jack Frenchman's Lamentation, or of other contemporary ballads in the same meaure. The two stanzas of the

[•] In point of fact the volumes were purchased by an individual named Money, perhaps as Steevens's agent. He gave 6s. 6d. for them. See Sale Catalogue of Dr. Johnson's Library, ed. by A. E. Newton, 1925, p. 8.

† Bibliotheca Heberiana, pt. 1, p. 331 (23rd day's sale, May 6, 1834).

opera Semele, written in a like form, are too strictly regular to be comparable.

Lady Cowper's credit as a witness, in a matter of this kind, is, I think, open to serious question. Any observations she has to make on contemporary drama or literature are slight and uninformed. Prior is mentioned only in a political capacity; Pope not at all, nor Gay, nor Swift, nor Addison. She reports without demur a statement by that questionable character, Philip Horneck, "that Sir Richard Steele had no Hand in writing the Town Talk, which was attributed to him; that it was one Dr. Mandeville and an Apothecary of his Acquaintance that wrote that Paper" (Diary of Mary Countess Cowper, 2nd ed. 1865, p. 64). Mandeville cannot be credited with the authorship of Town-Talk; and it is, at least, possible that Lady Cowper attributed Jack Frenchman's Lamentation to Congreve on hearsay as valueless.

Nevertheless, the entry in her diary deserves the attention which must attach to contemporary reference; and it may be, as Sir Charles Firth suggests, that Swift and Congreve both had a hand in the ballad. They were in touch with each other at the time of its composition.

In the note contributed to the last number Sir Charles Firth observes that there is yet room for investigating "the question of Swift's unacknowledged productions"; and, it may be added, some commonly accepted claims for Swift still call for consideration. The scholarly introduction to Mr. G. C. Faber's edition of The Poetical Works of John Gay, recently published, contains a valuable discussion of several of the doubtful verse pieces. Incidentally it is worth mention that Mr. Faber questions, and not unjustifiably, another claim for Congreve, the "Ballad on Quadrille." Two possible Swift pieces, discussed by him, are of special interest, "Newgate's Garland" and "The Quidnuncki's." In Bathurst's collected editions of Swift's Works the "Miscellanies in Verse" section is introduced with the note, "Whatever are not mark'd with a Star are Dr. Swift's," and both "Newgate's Garland" and "The Quidnuncki's" are marked with stars. Mr. Faber conjectures that Swift may have wished to dissociate himself from some of his children, and suggests that the stars are not to be taken too seriously. He might have added that even if they be due to hints supplied by Pope, the editorial work in Bathurst's editions is often careless and unintelligent, and the stars may, to some extent, be counted as movable rather than fixed. But, disregarding them so far, Mr. Faber, as opposed to Dr. Elrington Ball's claim for Swift's authorship of both pieces (*Notes and Queries*, 12 S. xii. 174), makes out a strong case against "Newgate's Garland," at least in its five-stanza form.

"The Quidnuncki's" stands in a different category, although Mr. Faber is content to print it with the Gay doubtfuls. As Dr. Ball remarks, it "foreshadows Gulliver's Travels;" and, it should be added, with a close similarity of phrase in its description of monkeys most readily to be expected from the author of the "Voyage to the Houyhnhnms," or from a friend who had seen the manuscript. This piece, occasioned by the death of the Duke of Orleans in December 1723, first appeared as a broadside, "A Poem Address'd to the Quidnunc's . . . Printed in the Year MDCCXXIV." Neither Dr. Ball nor Mr. Faber has noted that it was just at this time that Swift finished writing the "Voyage to the Houyhnhnms." In a letter dated January 19, 1723-4, Swift wrote to Ford: "I have left the Country of Horses, and am in the flying Island, where I shall not stay long, and my two last Journves will be soon over." * At the end of 1723 and the beginning of 1724 his mind would be full of the "Voyage to the Houyhnhnms." The date "increases the probability" in favour of Swift, for it is unlikely that Gay had seen any description of Yahoos at the time. For what it is worth it may also be noted that the poem" A Letter from the Quidnunc's," in Smedley's Gulliveriana (1728), pp. 94-100, is written on the supposition that "The Quidnuncki's" came from Dublin.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

A FURTHER NOTE ON HAU KIOU CHOAAN

I AM much indebted to Mr. Powell for pointing out a mistake in my note on the early relations of Goldsmith and Percy, which appeared in the issue of the *Review of English Studies* for January 1926. The date 1764 which I misleadingly gave as the date of the reissue of *Hau Kiou Choaan* should have been 1774. This reissue, which Mr. Powell

This excerpt is taken from a letter, hitherto unprinted, belonging to a private collection which Mr. D. Nichol Smith is editing for publication by the Clarendon Press. It was previously cited by Sir Charles Firth in his paper on "The Political Significance of Gulliver's Travels" (Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. ix.), and Mr. Nichol Smith kindly allowed me to make use of the extract in the Introduction (p. xxi.) to my edition of Gulliver's Travels.

thinks was never published, does however exist, and there are two copies of it at the British Museum, one of which came from the Library of George III., and the other bears the bookplate of the Right Honourable Thomas Grenville. Apparently these do not belong to a second edition in the ordinary sense; they seem to be a reissue of the 1761 edition, with the insertion of some six pages at the beginning of volume i. These pages contain the dedication, dated 1761, and the advertisement, dated 1774, which is the same as that quoted by Mr. Powell from Douce's copy. On the reverse side of the "Advertisement" leaf there appears first the extract of a letter from Canton—that inserted in the second edition of the Reliques quoted by Mr. Powell in his footnote—and then the following note:—

This History has been well received in France, where a Translation of it was published under the following title

of it was published under the following title.

Hau Kiou Choaan, Histoire chinoise, Traduite de l'Anglois, par
M. . . . 4 tom (dans 2) 12 mo. à Lyon, chez Benoit Duplain libraire
Rue Mercière, à l'Aigle 1766.

Then follows the Preface, which is the same as that in the ordinary 1761 edition. The dedication, however, presents a further puzzle. It is dated 1761, but, although Percy at first ignored Shenstone's plea for a less obsequious ending, it appears after all to have made some impression on him, for the signed dedication of the reissue ends thus:

One reward of my labours I have already obtained in the opportunity they afford me of acknowledging the great obligations I am under to my Lord Sussex's family, and to your Ladyship in particular, and of testifying the great respect with which I am, Madam, your Ladyship's most obliged and faithful servant, Thomas Percy, M.D.C.C. LXI.

The last six words of the dedication to the first edition, "to which I owe so much," are now omitted, as Shenstone wished. I suppose that by 1774, when Percy was Chaplain, not only to the Duke of Northumberland, but also to the King, he did not care to "owe so much," at least in public, to his first patron. But it is odd that the original date is retained in this signed dedication.*

^{*} Unfortunately the dedication is lacking in my copy of the 1761 edition, and I do not know whether there are any other divergencies besides this one to which Mr. Powell's article drew my attention. In a footnote to R.E.S., vol. 2, p. 449, Mr. Powell gives the conclusion of the edition of 1761. "One reward of my labours I have already obtained, in the opportunity they afford me of acknowledging the great obligations I am under to the House of Sussex, and to your Ladyship in particular, and of pouring forth every ardent wish for the happiness and welfare of that noble family, to which I owe so much."

Whether or no Wilkinson translated Hau Kiou Choaan directly from the Chinese or through the intermediary of Portuguese is a question that one would be glad to have settled, although its interest is not exactly literary. It could only be definitely established, I suppose, by some one with a thorough knowledge of both languages. I now think, however, that Mr. Powell is right in holding that the translation was made direct from the Chinese, and Percy's footnote to vol. ii. p. 203, "The pitcher goes often up and down the well, but is broken at last," * does as far as it goes bear this out. Percy's own account, which Mr. Powell rightly stresses, is unfortunately rather ambiguous in its phrasing. He says in his Preface:

The History is contained in four thin books of Chinese paper; which, after the manner of that Country, are doubled in the foredge and cut on the back. The first three volumes are in English; the fourth in Portuguese; and written in a different hand from the former. This part the Editor hath now translated into our own language.

The Reverend I. Pickford no doubt took "The Editor" here to mean "The Translator," i.e. Wilkinson, not Percy; a very natural mistake; and I think that Miss Gaussen probably assumed that the fourth MS. volume, which was in Portuguese, alone contained the novel, and that the other three (English) volumes contained other matter relating to China. As a matter of fact, it appears as if the four MS. volumes correspond roughly to the four books into which Percy divided the history. At p. 62, Book IV., the following footnote appears: "From this place to the end of the History, the translation is carried on in the Portuguese language; which the Editor hath rendered into English." The Editor here, as always, is Percy, and presumably Wilkinson's share in the translation ended with the English part. The remaining volume in Portuguese may of course have been part of Wilkinson's source, if that source was Portuguese; but I think it more probable that his work was completed by some Portuguese friend. The translation into Portuguese was made by a not very literate person; Percy complains several times of the corruption of the text.

In the first three books of the novel, Percy carefully annotates his alterations of the MS. translation. As usual, his notions of

^{• &}quot;The Translator hath here subjoined the original words Wauh quoan poo by tzhing shan po. The Reader will remark the difference between this proverb and its correspondent one with us, The pitcher goes many times to the well, but comes home broken at last."

editorial duty are rather liberal. For instance, he omits and condenses in the interests of brevity and decorum, and sometimes "where the incidents were inartificially conducted a discovery which seemed rather premature, hath been postponed for a few pages." He sometimes attempts, without much success, to soften the literalness of the Translator's rendering. For instance, for Wilkinson's "what should make you speak with two tongues, one of your gravity and office? Is it not enough when you speak once?" he reads: "He even ventured to remonstrate to his Excellence the inconsistency which had appeared in his conduct, and which seemed unsuitable to one of his gravity and office." On the whole Percy's "improvements" are not particularly happy. "Papers with congratulatory inscriptions" is colourless beside the racy "papers with great letters of welcome writ upon them." And "I believe that her complexion is fair and clear as the most limpid stream" is an indefensible paraphrase of "there is no water fairer than she."

Miss Balderston, who has recently republished the Percy memoir of Goldsmith, kindly wrote to draw my attention to the passage about "our Chinese" in the letter of August 14, 1758, to which Mr. Powell refers. She thinks, no doubt correctly, that Percy and Goldsmith independently became interested in things Chinese, and then when they met they quickened and stimulated each other's explorations in this new field. In any case the phase was perhaps fortunately

a brief one for both writers.

ALDA MILNER-BARRY.

[The above was shown in proof to Mr. L. F. Powell, who writes as follows:]

I am able, thanks to the expert aid of Mr. Arundell Esdaile and Mr. J. V. Scholderer, to supplement Miss Milner-Barry's account of what may, perhaps, be called the second issue of *Hau Kiou Choaan*. The two copies in the British Museum (243. i. 30-31 and G. 15006-9) are both dated 1761 on the titlepage, and the date is not false. The first quire, A, of volume 1 consists of nine leaves, excluding the frontispiece; A 4, containing the last leaf of the Dedication, is a *folium cancellans* and forms a fold with the following leaf, containing the Advertisement, etc. This somewhat unusual make-up is explained by Percy's procedure in 1774, when, provoked by the doubts cast on the authenticity of the novel, he added the Advertisement leaf; at the same time, cancelling the original A4, he took the opportunity to improve the Dedication and to acknowledge the paternity of the book. M1 and M2 of volume 1 are cancels in the Bodleian copy and in both the Museum copies. It is of interest to find

that the new fold is printed on the same paper (Britannia foolscap) as the rest of the book.

There are no other variants in the Dedication than those given by Miss Milner-Barry. The absence of the Dedication in her copy may not be due to accident, but may indicate another change of Percy's vacillating mind: "Dedication is a paultry kind of writing," he said in 1761.

The passage from the Preface quoted by Miss Milner-Barry is, as she

says, ambiguous, but the following passage, also from the Preface, is

free from ambiguity:

"As the version was the work of a gentleman whose province was trade, and who probably never designed it for the Public, nothing could be expected from him but fidelity to the original; and this, if one may judge from the erasures and corrections that abound in the manuscript, was not neglected; which the general prevalence of the Chinese idiom will serve to confirm."

L. F. POWELL.

Oxford.

P.S.—Mr. F. Miller of Annan tells me that the London Library copy of Hau Kiou Choaan is also of the second issue. - L. F. P.

AN EARLIER AND A LATER ROLLIAD

Among English political satires few are more enjoyable and few that have any merit are less known than The Rolliad and its successors— Political Eclogues, Political Miscellanies, and Probationary Odes for the Laureatship—which appeared in the Morning Post during 1784 and 1785. The Rolliad itself-or, to give its full title, Criticisms on the Rolliad *-consists of extracts, with extensive prose comments, from an imaginary epic in heroic couplets dealing with the exploits of Rollo, Duke of Normandy. In reality it is an attack on the "immaculate boy," Pitt, and his friends in the Whig Party.

Curiously enough, twenty-five years before The Rolliad was published, the elder George Colman had written a mock-heroic poem in the same meter and with the same title. Here, however, the similarity ceases; for Colman's production contains no prose and is not political, but narrates the dire results that follow when a penurious English housewife discovers on her breakfast-table a

Yet at least one edition, that published in 1795, has simply The Rolliad as its main title. The bibliography of the subject is baffling; for omissions and additions were made from time to time in each of the four works comprising the series, and almost any combination of editions of some or all of these works was likely to be bound together and labelled *The Rolliad*. The Harvard Library, for example, has eight volumes belonging to the group, no two of which are alike and no one of which has, I think, everything contained in the others. A contributor to Notes and Queries (6th Series, ii. 226) owned a copy of the twenty-first edition (1799) of The Rolliad itself.

French roll "piping hot." Since the poem begins with the rising of the sun and of the heroine, and contains the line,

My Lady frowns, and all the house looks glum,*

it seems to be in part a kind of parody of *The Rape of the Lock*. Perhaps because it was unfinished and extended to only seven pages, it was not printed until 1787, when the other *Rolliad* was enjoying a great vogue. But Colman took care to inform the world on publishing his poem that it "had a being and a name long before the existence of the popular political work lately known under that title." †

Early in 1788, less than three years after the publication of the last of the satires usually associated with The Rolliad, there appeared in the London bookshops a thin, anonymous octavo with the title, Extracts from the Album, at Streatham; or, Ministerial Amusements. To which are added, The Bulse, T a Pindaric Ode: and Jekyll, an Eclogue. The title-piece in this volume is a patent imitation of The Rolliad, being a political satire in a series of parts, each (except the first) containing poetry with prose comments on it. Even the title is similar, and the men attacked are in general the same. The indebtedness is frankly acknowledged in the "Advertisement," where we read: "That the following Extracts have in their outline such a resemblance to the celebrated Critiques of the Rolliad, as to subtract from their claims to originality, the Editor will freely confess. . . . he owns his obligations there." The device, however, is new and, so far as I remember, unique. After the fatigues of averting war with France, Pitt and his fellow-ministers are supposed to have retired to Streatham to amuse themselves at the "hospitable Mansion" of Thomas Steele, Secretary of the Treasury. The amusement takes the form, fashionable at the time, of writing original verses in an album.

Appended to the Extracts are two poems that have no connection with it, the second of which is The Jekyll, a Political Eclogue, "by the authors of the Rolliad, etc." Now, this satire is also included in Political Eclogues, a continuation of The Rolliad by the same authors and usually printed as a part of it. The Dictionary of National

Colman, Prose on Several Occasions (1787), ii. 292; cf. The Rape of the Lock, ii. 52. In each poem a bell is rung before the heroine rises.

[†] Prose, i. p. xviii.
† The occasion of this satire is explained in Notes and Queries, 2nd Series, viii.
408, and 7th Series, ix. 367; but no reference is made to this particular poem.

Biography assigns The Jekyll to Joseph Richardson (1755-1803), to whom, according to the catalogue of the Harvard Library, "the authorship of the whole [Extracts volume] has been ascribed." This ascription is, however, almost certainly wrong, since there is every reason for regarding Lord John Townsend and Richard Tickell as the authors of The Jekyll.* But whether Richardson or Townsend, it matters little. What is of interest is not the name of the author, but the probability that the Extracts was the work of some of the group who produced The Rolliad and its sequels. In the first place, the printer is the same, and so are type, paper, and format. Secondly, each is a political satire on approximately the same persons, each contains poetry with prose comments, and each, in its first edition, is divided into the same number of parts or short chapters. Thirdly, each volume contains The Jekyll. And finally, to the second edition of the Extracts (published in 1788, the same year as the first) was added the prose Journal of the Right Hon. Henry Dundas, which was likewise included in the later editions of the Political Miscellanies.+

Accordingly, unless copies of the volume can be found with contemporary ascriptions to other writers, there seems to be good warrant for regarding the Extracts from the Album at Streatham not so much an imitation as a continuation of the Rolliad group of satires.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

The Johns Hopkins University.

JOHN HONEYMAN, THE CAROLINE ACTOR-DRAMATIST

It is curious how the fact that John Honeyman was dramatist as well as actor should have become long forgotten. One wonders whether the variant spellings of his name have had anything to do

* See Notes and Queries, 1st Series, ii. 43, 114, 373. The Literary Relics of Joseph Richardson (1807) does not mention The Jekyll among Richardson's works.

† As the Journal is supposed to run from October 1787 to March 14, 1788, it must have been completed after the appearance of the 1787 edition of the Political Miscellanies and after the first edition of the Extracts, the "Advertisement" to which is dated "Feb. 20, 1788." According to Notes and Queries (1st Series, iii. 131), it "came out in numbers, or rather in continuations, in the Newspaper," and was the work of Tierney, Dr. Lawrence, and C. Grey.

1 The printed catalogue of the British Museum lists The New Rolliad, Number 1

The printed catalogue of the British Museum lists The New Rolliad, Number I (1785), which it describes as "A set of fictitious extracts from an imaginary epic, on the plan of the Rolliad. . . . A satire on the chiefs of the opposition party, etc." It would be interesting to know if other numbers of this work, apparently a

counterblast from Pitt's side, were issued and who were the authors.

with this lapse. Be that as it may, no one since Tom Davies seems to have been aware that he wrote for the stage. Discussing the downfall of the theatres at the Interregnum in his *Dramatic Miscellanies*,* Davies writes:

In these distracted times what became of those comedians who had represented queens, princesses, and other females, in Shakespeare's, Ben Jonson's, Beaumont and Fletcher's, and Massinger's plays, at this distance of time cannot be learned; for no historical trace of them is to be found. The two most celebrated of these performers were John Thomson and John Hunnieman. The last was the author of a play with the name of which I should be glad to enrich the dramatic catalogue, but I cannot learn whether it was a tragedy, a comedy, or a mixture of both. From a copy of verses to the author by Sir Aston Cockaine, we are informed that this dramatic piece was much approved by the public; as Sir Aston's epistle contains the only information of Hunnieman's authorship, I shall transcribe it as a theatrical curiosity:

To Mr. John Hunnieman.

On, hopeful youth, and let thy happy strain Redeem the glory of the stage again; Lessen the loss of Shakspeare's death, by thy Successful pen and fortunate phantasy. He did not only write but act, and so Thou dost not only act, but writest too. Between you there no difference appears, But what may be made up with equal years. This is my suffrage, and I scorm my pen Should crown the heads of undeserving men.

Great must have been the loss of this play to the public, if Hunnieman was a rival of Shakespeare, as is suggested by Sir Aston.

Davies's ingenuousness amuses. We to-day know better how to discount the extravagances of seventeenth-century encomiastic verse. But, without being deceived by Cokain's exuberance, we may lament with Davies that nothing of Honeyman's has come down to us. It is difficult to see, however, by what process of reasoning Davies arrived at the conclusion that Honeyman had written only one play at the time when such overpowering praise was showered upon him. The phrase "successful pen" seems to point to more than one essay.

Even as an actor, only momentary glimpses are to be had of Honeyman. Introduced to the stage by John Shanks the comedian, who procured him for the King's Men, he first emerges as boyplayer at the Blackfriars in October 1626, when he was seen as

^{*} Dublin, 1784, i. p. 183.

Domitilla in *The Roman Actor*. In November 1628 he was in the cast of *The Lover's Melancholy*, and in the following June played Sophia in *The Picture*. Sometime in 1629, or possibly a year earlier, he was the original Clarinda in Carlell's *The Deserving Favourite*. In May 1631 he played the First Merchant (and with it possibly doubled a female character) in *Believe as You List*. Our last trace of him on the stage is in November 1632, when he doubled Mariana and the Young Factor in the Blackfriars revival of *The Wild Goose Chase*.* Fletcher's play, it is to be noted, though first acted in 1621, was not printed until 1652, when an almost complete cast of characters (in which Honeyman's name occurs) was given. But the cast must have been of a late revival, since Stephen Hamerton, who played Oriana, had only just joined the King's Men in 1632.

Honeyman was dead by 1646, in which year an elegy upon him was published in Thomas Jordan's Love's Dialect, or Poeticall

Varieties.

Since Davies in the foregoing extract refers to Honeyman's coplayer, John Thomson, it may be as well to draw attention to the fact that John Shanks, in his petition of 1635,† speaks of him as then deceased. In the satirical list of important events given in Ralph Desmus's almanac, *Merlinus Anonymous*, issued on November 18, 1653,‡ one reads, "Thomson the player died of the govvt, 1652." This was Sam Thompson, who was a member of the King's Revels (Salisbury Court) company in 1634,§ and whose name figures in the cast of Nathaniel Richards's *Messallina*.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

J. Q. Adams, Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, p. 44.

[†] For which see J. Tucker Murray, English Dramatic Companies, ii. p. 152.
† Brit. Mus. E. 1487 (1), sig. B, 8v.
§ Cf. The Fortnightly Review for April 1925, p. 519, F. S. Boas on Crossfield's Oxford Diary.

REVIEWS

The English Language in America. By George Philip Krapp. New York: The Century Co. for the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1925. Vol. I. pp. xiii.+377; Vol. II. pp. 355. 42s. net.

The discussion of forms of speech current east and west of the Atlantic can now free itself from social prejudice and journalistic inexactitude; the problems connected with the English language in America have now been set forth by a scholar who is a master of his subject; and Professor Krapp shows, as Professor Wyld showed in his Colloquial English, that a book based on scientific deduction from accumulated facts and accurately documented, need not repel the general reader. Our author makes use of detail, but always of relevant detail; and the clearness of his style is no less striking than the depth of his learning. He is no mere recorder of the external phenomena of language; though he steers clear of general psychological linguistics, it is obvious that his chief interest in language is its reflexion of mental attitudes, changing states of culture, conflicts in social ideals.

In a short Preface of thirteen pages the author defines his own attitude towards the subject of his work. He notes the gradual fixing of standards in both countries, and the part played in this process by great lexicologists. He delivers a much-needed attack on the "self-satisfied class of the illiterates." Reminding us that "Popular American speech is no more the real American language than the speech of the London coster is the genuine speech of England," he asks, "of the many forms of a highly-developed language like English . . ., who shall insist that the crude only may be genuine?" Nor is his warning unneeded: "Good grammar . . . has as ancient a history as bad grammar." His historical investigations make it clear that genuine American-English is far more closely related to the King's English and to the

body of English literature than unscientific writers on both sides

of the Atlantic have supposed.

The first section of the first volume, The Mother Tongue, traces the development of national speech-consciousness among the American people. It records the early prejudices of the two countries, and the natural tendency of the two parties, fresh from a quarrel, to exaggerate the speech-differences that separated them. In the new nation were persons to whom a distinct American language was an ideal. It is interesting in this connexion to note Webster's view that the language of contemporary England had declined from that of the reign of Queen Anne, and was no longer a model worthy of imitation.

Professor Krapp reminds us of the main difficulty which confronted the idealists, namely, the absence of a social capital which might counteract the disintegrating effect of manifold local speech-variations. He points out that this fear of disintegration has always been before the eyes of thoughtful Americans, whether statesmen or educators; and one is forced sadly to contrast this fact with the apathy still shown by British governments towards speech-disintegra-

tion within the Empire.

The unifying force in American society is the school; hence the standard is not so much social as literary. A parallel is drawn between the United States and Germany, in that American standard English is neither an extended local dialect nor a class dialect, but is based on the normal daily uses of the written language.

We are introduced to the three main speech-types of the United States, and we are enabled to see how it is that the extremes of local variety are less distant from the standard language than are our

own dialects.

With scientific precision and freedom from bias, Professor Krapp examines the question of profit and loss in British and American idiom.

In his second section, Vocabulary, he sums up the arguments for and against the existence of two separate English languages. American and British English are not identical, but they are equal elements in the unity of the English language: "The mother-tongue of all those who use English is not the English of any particular region or of any defined section of society." As to the couple of hundred words on which the theory of two separate idioms is mainly based, Professor Krapp finds in them nothing specially characteristic

of either nation. In this section there are valuable remarks on the relation of vocabulary to life and thought.

The third and fourth sections deal respectively with PLACE NAMES and PROPER NAMES. One notes the occurrence of Virginian names with pronunciations as far removed from their spellings as any we can boast of on this side. One notes, also, that on the other side they were nearly three centuries ahead of us in forming words of the Bakerloo type. The author's remarks on the attitude of the colonists towards Indian names suggest the parallel treatment of Celtic names by the Anglo-Saxon colonists of Britain.

The fifth section, LITERARY DIALECTS, is a careful analysis of the relation of literary to local and class dialect.

The sixth section, STYLE, is especially illuminative. The great writers whose work Americans cherish as expressing their national literary aspirations, "have united themselves to the central tradition of the language as naturally as Carlyle the Scotchman did, or Kipling the East Indian, or as any Canadian, Australian, or South African would who felt compelled to write English." But, on the other hand, America has developed, during the nineteenth century, two forms of popular style, the "picturesque slang" and the "rustic," which have no analogues in England. Their practical and æsthetic values, as well as the social and psychological conditions of their development, our author discusses with acumen.

The seventh section, AMERICAN SPELLING, effectually destroys most popular notions on the subject. Apparently the American Simplified Spelling Board has not yet done any more mischief than our own Simplified Spelling Society; for educated American opinion has remained still more conservative than Webster. We learn that to minor variations, such as centre-center, favour-favor, educated America attaches no more significance than they deserve.

A short section on AMERICAN DICTIONARIES concludes the first volume, the whole of the contents of which will prove of absorbing interest to all readers of the Review of English Studies.

The appeal of the second volume is mainly to philologists. The greater part is devoted to a minute examination of the whole course of the phonological development of the English language in America.

A very striking fact which emerges from these detailed and accurate studies is the close parallelism between American phenomena and the hitherto more widely known course of development

of the English language in Great Britain. One may instance a few selected points: the twofold development of final [n]; the quantitative and qualitative variations denoted by the spelling ea; the varying developments of M.E. $[\epsilon:][\epsilon:]+[r]$; the interchange of $[\epsilon]$ and [x] and of $[\epsilon]$ and [I]; the intricate course of the beardheard types; the struggle between the two pronunciations of tu in e.g. fortune, creature; the eighteenth-century assimilation of the sounds denoted by oi and i; the later tendency towards the assimilation of [o:r] and [or]. Curiously enough, the early American records give no indication of loss or insertion of initial h. But at the present day both countries exhibit exactly the same variations in the first elements of the diphthongs written i and ou, and neither country has entirely lost an archaic pronunciation of the word girl. When one has learnt from Professor Krapp the complicated nature of the development in America of M.E. short a, one begins to surmise that in our own country, with its far more numerous local and social dialects, the development can scarcely have followed the simple straight lines of orthodox phonological theory.

Detailed knowledge of the proportions contributed by the English counties to the population of the United States, has yet to be sought. Meanwhile, Professor Krapp's investigations indicate one fruitful method of approach. He notes that the vocalisation of [r] and the voicing of the sound written wh are common to New England and Southern England; that the West of England has left its traces in the New England pronunciation of the group -ange with a short vowel, and in the New England survival of [e:] in words like please, deceit: that the New York pronunciation of er, ir before a consonant as [əi] is probably a survival from a Yorkshire dialect; that early American usage reflected our Southern and Midland change of [v] to [w]. One might add to this that the sporadic Elizabethan shortening and advancing of [o:] which he proves to have spread freely on New England soil, is still found right across the English Midlands; and that the colloquial use of 'em for them, and the archaic New England n-plural noted in the final section of the book are yet

i

T

tł

n

h

another inheritance from Southern England.

The phonological studies in this volume end with a valuable

section on unstressed syllables.

The final section is entitled INFLEXIONS AND SYNTAX. Here Professor Krapp denies the existence of any considerable number of foreign forms of phrasing. Even popular variations of tense-forms

are explained on the basis of the normal changes inherent in language; and, indeed, most of these changes are to be found in our own dialects.

On the subject of shall and will I do not find myself in complete agreement with the learned author. That a usage which is wide-spread in the United States and a great part of the British Empire can be labelled "improper" only by the ignorant, may be at once admitted. It is also beyond dispute that "at no time and in no place has usage been as definitely organized as the principles of the grammarians require"; and one might add that this truth holds good of most of the facts of language. Yet the tendency to attach different modal values to shall and will does (as Professor Krapp himself notes) actually form part of the speech-habits of a very great number of English-speaking persons; and if such subtleties really are (as Professor Krapp holds) due to the conscious striving of grammarians, surely even grammarians, as well as other blundering thinkers, may be allowed a small share in the development of language.

I have one more insignificant criticism to make; the polite use of the third person in address is not confined to America; with us, however, it expresses the speaker's conscious attitude of social inferiority.

The second volume includes a valuable bibliography and full indexes.

Professor Krapp's work will take its place in this country among the few great books on the English language.

J. H. G. GRATTAN.

Fielding the Novelist: A Study in Literary Reputation. By Frederic T. Blanchard. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. Pp. xiv. 655. 30s. net.

THE case of Fielding is an instructive exception to the general rule that a writer's greatness is appreciated by the few in his own time and not till afterwards by the many; in other words, that the verdict of educated readers is more just than that of the multitude. Fielding won a popular success with Joseph Andrews, and seven years later his Tom Jones was received with a burst of applause from the great

reading public. His vogue was so considerable that in two more years he was paid £800 for the much smaller novel Amelia; and. although he lost rather than gained in favour with this last, his works, individually and collectively, went into edition after edition during the two decades after his death. Yet throughout that period he was almost entirely without recognition by any one of eminence in the world of letters. He was not merely without recognition, he was reviled as a man and condemned as a writer by all whose opinion mattered. When Gibbon spoke of him as a "great master," and wrote that his "immortal romance of Tom Jones . . . will outlast the palace of the Escurial and the Imperial Eagle of the House of Austria," he was giving utterance to a conviction that to his contemporaries sounded monstrous and inexplicable. It is not too much to say that not till our own day, or the very eve of it, did Fielding come completely into his own; he was one of those great ones who have written not for their own but for all time, and only at long last have we arrived at the stage of humane understanding at which he can have his due.

It is the strange vicissitudes of Fielding's fame that Professor Blanchard has undertaken to record with praiseworthy fullness, and it is indeed "a singular story of antagonisms and misconceptions." His book of 655 pages, with its ample bibliography and its analytical index, looks formidable; but the reader interested either in Fielding, as every intelligent reader now is, or in the history of critical opinion, would be loath to miss a single paragraph. Professor Blanchard's love and admiration for Fielding are so sincere and so well-founded that after reading him one feels a kind of personal resentment towards Richardson and Dr. Johnson for their aspersions, and only too much inclined to visit on their work the injustice they dealt out to their great contemporary.

With exactly the right amount of detail, Professor Blanchard shows how, through political animosity, personal malice, or professional spite, Fielding was either ignored or vilified in the leading reviews of his time, the London Magazine, Old England, and the Gentleman's Magazine. Pope, Gray, Young, Walpole, Johnson, Hurd, Chesterfield, all those whose names would exert a powerful influence upon an author's reputation, had "either ill words for him or practically none." Smollett libelled him grossly, although he afterwards endeavoured to make some amends for his detraction. His cousin, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, gave the authority of a

relative to the view that he was a debauchee and a spendthrift, that he spent his time as a magistrate "raking in the lowest sinks of vice and misery," and that his books were hastily put together to get him a disreputable living. These and the like unsavoury reports were given a further currency by Walpole and other influential writers, including Dr. Johnson. But perhaps the worst of Fielding's misfortunes was that they were accepted with a great deal more of the same stamp by his supposed friend Arthur Murphy, to whom was entrusted the memoir prefixed to the first collected edition of the works. Murphy was probably the author of the patronising and apologetic introduction to the Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon (1755). At any rate, he gave the sanction of an intimate friend and the vividness of circumstantial relation to the current scandal in what Professor Blanchard characterises as this "blackguardly life of the novelist."

But the chief figure opposed to Fielding in this deplorable comedy is of course that vindictive object of his satire in Joseph Andrews, the novelist Richardson. The author of Pamela never forgave him. Fielding's popularity was gall and wormwood to his rival; any syllable of praise for Tom Jones or Amelia was a blow at the creator of Clarissa. He described Fielding's characters and situations as "wretchedly low and dirty," made out that Tom Jones and Booth were impersonations of Fielding himself and a couple of blackguards, and never ceased to traduce his enemy, together with his works, his wife, and everything that belonged to him, even when that enemy lay in the grave.

Richardson, as the author makes clearer than it ever was before, is the representative novelist of that age, the age of sentimentalism rather than of reason; he was the centre of a cult, and his malignant insinuations against the character and works of Fielding, the representative of what we may call the modern spirit, or the English spirit of freedom and humour that time after time has arisen victorious over its persistent enemy, a narrow and repressive puritanism, met with no remonstrance from his adherents and no refutation from Fielding's friends. Dr. Johnson, Richardson's friend and under personal obligations to him, loyally supported the author of Clarissa and professed to believe him the greatest of novelists. His pompous declaration that Richardson "taught the passions to move at the command of virtue," and the critical dictum that "Richardson had picked the kernel of life . . . while Fielding

was contented with the husk," sound ludicrous in these days of enlightenment. His disparagement was inexplicable to Boswell, who had the sense to rate Fielding at his proper worth and took the arch-critic to task more than once on the matter. Was Johnson altogether sincere, was he quite honest to himself, in his condemnation of Fielding? From several incidents quoted here it is evident that he knew in his heart that Fielding was not merely great but the very criterion by which greatness must be measured. Taken off his guard, Johnson acknowledged all this. "Harry Fielding never drew so good a character!" he wrote in congratulating Fanny Burney on Evelina. "Very well said," he cried, when somebody remarked that "Fielding, who was so admirable in novel-writing, never succeeded when he wrote for the stage." Richardson showed himself up in his Correspondence, published after his death; that revelation of his pettiness and illiberality "did irretrievable damage to its writer's fame." The fallacy on which the view of Johnson and other critics was based, apart from the prejudice due to their acceptance of mendacious gossip, the fallacy that he who paints low life must necessarily himself be low, is now seen to be as illogical as the humorous adage, "Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat"-Dr. Johnson's own witticism.

Scott, in his faithful portraiture of the life he knew best, though not in the historical romance which his admirers overpraised, showed that he had learned more from Fielding than from any other author; yet he recapitulated the old slanders in his short life of Fielding. The general verdict of the principal men of letters in the Romantic Age was very different. Coleridge, Hazlitt, Lamb, Leigh Hunt, Byron, have left many obiter dicta paying tribute to the creator of Parson Adams, Squire Western, and Amelia, many of them profound and illuminating. Macaulay got into the wars with supporters of The Christian Observer by unwarily expressing his enthusiasm. For now, in the wane of romantic freedom, Malvolio, Tartuffe, and Pecksniff were reinstated in the censorial chair. Cobbett, Miss Ferrier, Archbishop Whateley, De Quincey, and, in the next generation, Carlyle, Tennyson, Browning, FitzGerald, Charlotte Brontë, and the numerous people who believed that historical romance was a higher form of art than realism, could not abide Fielding. "Stevenson denounced Tom Jones as 'dirty, low, and false'; Poe, much more rabid than his brother romancers, rejected the novelist utterly," says Professor Blanchard. Ruskin,

of course, who apotheosised Sir Charles Grandison, was unable to see anything in Richardson's contemporary. Even Matthew Arnold had no good word for him. The attitude to Fielding is a veritable touchstone for testing the imagination, the sense of humour, and the enlightenment of the age.

But the tide was about to turn. George Eliot was the first great novelist to admit without reserve the supremacy of Fielding, for Thackeray, who had set himself to emulate his realism, surrendered to Victorian prudery, confessed that he dare not tell the truth about life, and, perhaps even more unforgivably, went back on his earlier homage to his great model, and rehashed the stale libels for the delectation of an audience who loved to see a bad boy whipped and told how wickedly he had misused his talents. If, as Professor Wilbur Cross urged, "Thackeray really did more than any other man has done to stain the memory of Fielding," another novelist may perhaps prove in the long run to have done more than any one else to awaken the taste and enlightenment and the understanding of the spirit of intellectual comedy which must prevail if Fielding is to be appreciated in all his richness. Meredith's Essay on Comedy is a handbook to the comedy of Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, as well as to that of Molière and Congreve. Meredith was not only an inheritor of Fielding's art, but also one who developed it on certain independent lines. Mr. Arnold Bennett is quoted here as writing, "Between Fielding and Meredith no entirely honest novel was written by anybody in England," and probably, on reflection, we shall accept that as not far from the truth.

The last chapter of this review of the critics is pleasanter reading. It is the story of the final refutation of the oft-repeated slanders, and the rescue of a great and warm-hearted man from a world that had utterly failed to understand the fineness of his art or the nobility of his spirit. The researches of Keightley and Dobson, Henley's trenchant essay on the "Life, Genius, and Achievement" of Fielding, and, to crown all, the monumental biography by Professor Cross, have at length enabled us to contemplate the real Fielding; and Professor Blanchard's admirable survey allows us to measure the greatness of the work they have done. It is a warning against many pitfalls in the judging of men and books, and perhaps a chapter as illuminating in the history of criticism as a full-length treatise would be.

The illustrations from contemporary drawings are pleasing-

They come for the most part from American collections. It is rather an inconvenience to English readers that so many of the references are to American editions of various writers' collected works, and that the date of first publication of many pieces cited is not given. Combe's Dr. Syntax, whom Professor Blanchard affiliates to Parson Adams, was, surely, a caricature, in the prevailing Quixotic manner, of that celebrated tourist and connoisseur of romantic scenery, William Gilpin. What is meant by the remark that in his Don Sylvio Wieland "became a Fieldingite"? Was it as a disciple of Lucian and Cervantes, such as Fielding was? That work is nearer akin to the other fantasies in the Cabinet des Fées, in which Wieland's French translator included his abridgment.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith. By Katharine C. Balderston, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of English Literature in Wellesley College. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1926. Pp. 61. 35. 6d. net.

In this valuable little book, the outcome of its author's researches into contemporary records of the life of Goldsmith, the different threads which go to make up the so-called Percy Memoir are at last unravelled. Miss Balderston's book consists of two sections. In the first she traces the many vicissitudes of the memoir from the day in April 1773, when Goldsmith dictated the history of his life to Percy at Northumberland House, down to its final publication in 1802, with all the additions by the writer whom Percy indignantly called "The Interpolator"; this person Miss Balderston identifies, I think for the first time, with a fellow medical student of Goldsmith's at Edinburgh, one Dr. William Farr. In the second section Miss Balderston analyses the four chief sources for the memoir. Of these by far the most interesting and important is Percy's original memorandum of Goldsmith's information, now printed for the first time from Miss Meade's collection. This is headed by Percy "From his own mouth, April 28, 1773." Percy worked over it several times, as additional material came to hand, and he also underlined those statements of Goldsmith which he saw cause to doubt. The other sources are Percy's own personal memories of Goldsmith

(their intimate friendship is sometimes forgotten) the anecdotes of the Interpolator, and other anecdotes chiefly collected by Thomas Campbell, a clergyman under whose name Percy, with his usual timidity in literary matters, at one time thought of publishing the memoir. Miss Balderston assigns the subject-matter of the memoir to these four different sources in a useful table at the end of her book. It has long been known that the published memoir was almost as far removed from the original memorandum as the Reliques from the folio manuscript, but Miss Balderston's table makes clear for the first time what a patchwork the 116 or so pages of the memoir are. It is, I think, a pity that Miss Balderston has not republished the memoir in full; as she says, the sole edition is that prefixed to Goldsmith's Miscellaneous Works, London, 1801. It is not very easily accessible, and the value of her work for most readers would be increased if it served as a Preface to a new edition of the memoir. But perhaps Miss Balderston will include it in the new edition of Goldsmith's letters, on which I understand she is at present engaged.

Percy's problem, briefly stated, was this. How could he combine his anxiety to benefit the surviving relatives of Goldsmith by publishing his friend's biography, as Goldsmith had always intended that he should, with his own growing unwillingness to appear in public as a secular author? The history of his perplexities is an entertaining one, and Miss Balderston wisely allows it to speak for itself. She believes that this literary shyness was due to a nervous dread of raising up new Ritsons; but I am inclined to attribute it rather to Percy's long and dogged struggle to rise in his profession, which made him over-tender of ecclesiastical dignity. Slightly Gilbertian as this struggle was, and little to advantage as Percy sometimes shows in his dealings with publishers (Miss Balderston roundly calls him "a devious, formal and fussy collaborator"), one must respect his genuine desire to aid Goldsmith's impecunious relatives. Miss Balderston prints from the Meade Collection an interesting and oddly spelt letter from Maurice Goldsmith, which reveals something of the family fecklessness. She has also had access to various MS. letters in the possession of American owners, and has made good use of the Malone-Percy Correspondence in the Bodleian, and of Nichols' Literary Anecdotes, which always offer many interesting sidelights on the literary history of the later eighteenth century.

At one time Dr. Johnson thought of writing Goldsmith's life,

and Percy handed over to him the documents in his possession, It has usually been thought that Dr. Johnson lost these papers, and Percy at one time thought so himself. Miss Balderston now shows that some, at least, of the Goldsmith papers, including the original memorandum, returned to Percy at Dr. Johnson's death. I think she is perhaps unduly eager to acquit Dr. Johnson of the charges of indolence and carelessness usually made against him in the matter. He himself would never have attempted to rebuff these charges, and Percy knew, or should have known, the risk he was taking when he entrusted him with the papers; as early as 1765, we find him writing resignedly to Lord Hailes: "Mr. Johnson, who is the most careless man alive, never treasures up any papers." Dr. Johnson's life of Goldsmith would no doubt have made better reading than the composite production that by the irony of fate now passes under Percy's name. This, however, need not blind us to the value of the Percy memoir, or prevent us from congratulating Miss Balderston on her investigation of a little-known tract of literary history.

ALDA MILNER-BARRY.

Essays in Biography, 1680-1726. By Bonamy Dobrée. London: Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. xii.+362. 12s. 6d. net.

In this book, in which he deals with Etherege (as ambassador), Vanbrugh (as architect), and Addison (as "the first Victorian"), Mr. Dobrée has abandoned the methods which served him well in his Restoration Comedy, and has "tried in a limited degree to see and describe the events in the lives of my subjects from their own point of view." The method has, as he confesses, "its evident restrictions"; it has also evident dangers for a writer with a taste for the picturesque, and on his very first page Mr. Dobrée equips Etherege with the clothes and absurd affectations of his own Sir Fopling Flutter (following, no doubt, an unsupported accusation of Dean Lockier's) and with a boisterous laugh. The worst example, however, of the inevitably journalistic trend of the method will be found in the imaginary reflections of Etherege on his former friends, which Mr. Dobrée has manufactured for him at the beginning of the ninth section of the essay; for instance, "how bothered that

pompous little secretary to the Admiralty had been—what was his name? Ah yes, of course, Pepys, that was it." This kind of stuff, which any book-maker can compose by the yard stans pede in uno, is as unworthy of Mr. Dobrée as it is of Etherege.

Moreover, this method brings the biographer so near to his subjects that he cannot forbear sticking pins into them; the account of Etherege and his secretary is full of these pin-pricks; that of Vanbrugh is, though condescending, not unfriendly to the "grand [or "powerful"] old brute"; that of Addison, who is accused of an "inferiority complex," is almost spiteful, and such statements as "Never, Addison silently vowed, would he put himself in the wrong" incline the reader to sympathise with the victim rather than the critic. And why should Mr. Dobrée descend to such cheapness as the comparison of Addison's style with Addison Road, when he is capable, in the same paper, of the brilliant (and far more damaging) transference to the essayist of Miss Clarissa Harlowe's lament over Lovelace?

The fact is that Mr. Dobrée, in attempting to combine journalism with scholarship, falls between two stools. The effort to see and describe from a contemporary point of view has led him to adopt a style rather too arch, and knowing, and profuse of small satirical mysteries, for serious biography—and he has set about his biography seriously enough to devote great labour to it. The essay on Addison, though sometimes almost partisan in tone, shows wide and careful reading; that on Vanbrugh as an architect is the most considerable contribution hitherto made to the subject, and covers 135 pages. But though Mr. Dobrée is fairly liberal, in both these papers, in giving references to his sources, the references are not always adequate: there is a looseness of method about such footnotes as " Spectator " and " So Burnet " and " Luttrell, quoted by Ward." And while many of the quotations in the Vanbrugh essay are taken from MS. sources, those from a printed text are sometimes unfamiliar of aspect; for instance, the description of Van's House, "A Thing resembling a Goose Pye" as Swift's verses severely called it, is watered down to "A place resembling a goose pie." This makes one anxious about the MS. quotations, particularly as, in the preceding essay, Mr. Dobrée is sometimes in difficulties with the very legible and clerkly hand of the secretary's Letter Book; he transcribes twice (pp. 23 and 27) "host-master" for the MS. "hoff-master"; he runs together (p. 33) two separate entries, "of speaking in favour of his honour to the Commissioners of the Treasury of the story about his gaming being false", although there is no connection between the entry that ends with "Treasury" and the following one; and he fails altogether (p. 38) to read the word "Estat", for which he substitutes "[illegible]". Incidentally, it was not with "tall overgrown runners" (p. 37) that the German gentlemen furnished their parlours; "rummers" were more to their

purpose.

In his study of Etherege, Mr. Dobrée has given no references to the sources of his statements or quotations; he observes that "the authorities for this study of Etherege are so few, that I have not thought it necessary to note them in the text, as has been done in the case of the two succeeding essays." This statement, however, is followed by a list of fifteen sources, and though Mr. Dobrée cannot have got much information about Etherege out of some of them—Aubrey, and Burnet, and Garnett's Age of Dryden—it is unscholarly to omit references to authority in an essay so rich in imagination; casual readers may well go away with the idea that Etherege was known to be a person with a horse-laugh and a bad memory for names.

The lack of references in this essay is the more unfortunate, because Mr. Dobrée is not always trustworthy in matters of fact. He states (p. 14) that Etherege's secretary went out to him at Ratisbon about the end of February or beginning of March 1686. On the contrary, the secretary, who was engaged in England, went out with Etherege in the previous autumn; he tells us himself that "at his [Etherege's] first coming hither [to Ratisbon] I thôt I cou'd do no less than inform him of such stories, as I had heard reported of him but finding he was far from taking it in good part by asking how I was concerned; if I was sent with him for his governour &c. I resolv'd to say nothing." Mr. Dobrée does not quote the former part of this sentence, which would upset his theory; and in quoting the latter part he omits the word "with" [sent with him], which would also upset it. Again (p. 56), he says of Etherege, "Rumour had it that he had met his end in Paris, the bottle and a staircase having proved too mighty," etc. This is a confusion of sources; the incorrect rumour about falling downstairs at Ratisbon (not Paris) mentioned by Oldys, and the probably correct report of Etherege's death in Paris in 1601 given by Narcissus Luttrell.

Again (p. 49), Mr. Dobrée says of Etherege, "He was even commiserated at the time of his wedding:

'Tis said when George did dragon slay He saved a maid from cruel fray. But our Sir George (whom knaves do brag on) Miss'd of the maid and caught the dragon".

Evidently he has accepted the absurd statement, "Here Etherege's last name is not used, but he is obviously meant", made by Miss D. Foster in quoting these four lines in the Times Literary Supplement of February 16, 1922. The lines, like the poem from which they are taken, have nothing to do with Etherege; they refer to the notorious second marriage of Judge Jeffreys. And finally (p. 40), Mr. Dobrée. with various appropriate witticisms upon "a pastoral Etherege", attributes to his author the translation of O rus, quando te aspiciam which begins "Upon the downs when shall I breathe at ease?", and suggests (p. 55), being troubled by Dennis's assertion that Etherege knew no Latin, that his secretary must have helped him with the translation! This gives the finishing touch to a very pretty mare's nest of which the first builder was Sir Edmund Gosse, who in 1883 quoted the verses (under the erroneous impression that they had never been printed before) from the Letter Book as having been composed by Etherege. Thereupon Mr. Verity included them among Etherege's poems in his edition of 1888; and now Mr. Dobrée, still accepting their fabulous authorship, is at pains to provide Etherege (who quotes the Latin poets with admirable point in his letters) with assistance in making the translation! It is an amazing thing that these three writers, each of whom has devoted some attention not only to Etherege but to the Letter Book in which the verses are found, should all have ignored the fact that the lines (so entirely unlike any poem that Etherege has left us) were copied by the secretary among the "Letters Recd", and were carefully stated by him to be " Coff Ashtons."

H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH.

Beowulf. Translated into English Verse, with an Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. By D. H. CRAWFORD. London: Chatto & Windus. 1926. Pp. xxi. + 160. 5s. net.

THE desire to turn Beowulf into modern English seems to be growing, for this is the third metrical version to appear within recent years.

Mr. Crawford has selected a somewhat irregular unrhymed verse of four accents for his version: as a vehicle of translation this medium is the more successful as it permits greater freedom, but it does not communicate the vigour and dignity of the original as well as the longer line which has been used in the past for translations of *Beowulf*.

The vocabulary is well chosen, maintaining a difference between the descriptive passages and the battle-pieces; the reader is not distressed by archaisms of language or syntax, and the synonyms are skilfully managed. For the most part, the actual translation is accurate and runs smoothly, yet some criticism of details seems called for: prow of twisted wood is not a happy rendering of wudu wunden-hals, old men and young is colourless for duzuo ond zeozoo, and reddened was the hall with bodies of foemen is possibly extravagant

for wæs heal roden feonda feorum.

The scope of the book is considerable; it contains, in addition to the translation, a reproduction of a page of the MS., a brief introduction on the style of the poem and its historical background, illustrative extracts from Latin sources, an Appendix dealing with recent work on the Finn episode, a short Bibliography, Textual and Explanatory Notes, and an Index of Proper Names. Taking it all together it should have been a most useful little volume, but when one comes to consider it in detail it does not fulfil expectation. value of the Textual Notes is diminished by inaccuracies, e.g. MS. zoda (758), seczū (489) are given as zoda, seczu; and by the fact that most of them are of value only to a serious student of Anglo-Saxon with a copy of Beowulf open in front of him (indeed, the line references are those of the original and not of the translation). Surely this is a tactical error in an edition which should appeal to a public with little or no knowledge of Anglo-Saxon. Of another type are some of the objections that could be made. In the notes on the personages of the poem, matter for more than one controversy is provided. Why does Mr. Crawford gratuitously commit himself to the bald statement that "Beowulf excepted, he (Wiglaf) is the only brave man in the poem." There is sometimes a certain woolliness in the presentation of facts; important steps in the development of an incident may be ignored, and the notes are not always consistent one with another, to the confusion and irritation of the lay reader.

The treatment of proper names in modern versions of Beowulf is always a tiresome business; even where the translation of a name is

possible, it has seldom been found convenient. It is a curious whim that makes the author transform Dæzhrefn into Dayraven, while Scyld and Healfdene, whose names are quite as significant, undergo no equivalent change. The only possible principle in a work of this character is to ignore the variant spellings of the Anglo-Saxon, select one form of a name and use it throughout. This method is adopted for Beowulf himself, but Hyzelac appears variously as Hizelac and Hyzelac; a note calls attention to the three different forms of Weohstan (all are used in the translation but not parallel to the usage of the MS.), and this makes the more inexcusable the use of such forms as Eofor, Iofor, and Onzentheow, Onzenthio, without any such explanation.

ELSIE BLACKMAN.

On the Colophons and Marginalia of Irish Scribes. By the Rev. Charles Plummer, F.B.A. From the *Proceedings of* the British Academy. Oxford University Press. Price 3s. net.

As Ludwig Traube pointed out long ago, the MSS. of Irish scribes are distinguished from all others by the number and character of the scribal notes found in their margins. His work on the school of Sedulius showed what use could be made of these notes in elucidating the provenance of MSS. The practice was carried on into the later MSS. in the vernacular, and a great deal of information on the scribal schools and the relations of MSS. may be gathered from these delightful jottings. It is not Mr. Plummer's business here to exploit the notes in this way, but rather to exhibit their character and through them the character of the men who wrote our MSS. This he does with a pleasant and learned pen. It would be interesting, if space were available, to follow him through the MSS., noting with what happiness he elucidates these often obscure fragments and adding other examples from a different experience. But it must suffice here to call the attention of scholars in another field to the extraordinary fullness of detail found in these scribal notes. One source Mr. Plummer has not used, the long historical notes which the medical scribes were in the habit of introducing into their MSS., interesting examples of which were given by Father Paul Walsh in an article published some years ago.* We may end this notice with an inscription not noted by Mr. Plummer. The

^{*} Irish Ecclesiastical Record, August 1922, March 1923.

scribes often invoked blessings on themselves and their readers, and occasionally called down curses on their enemies. The blessings were, we hope, effective, but it appears that the curses were not, for one scribe writes (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 30512, f. 72):

Mallacht ar mo mhallachtaibh ní dhénaid díth do dhuine.

Or, in English:

My curse upon my curses all. They do no harm where'er they fall.

ROBIN FLOWER.

The Book of Troilus and Criseyde by Geoffrey Chaucer, edited from all the known Manuscripts by ROBERT KILBURN ROOT, Professor of English in Princeton University. London: Oxford University Press. Pp. xc. + 573. 278.

For this edition much thanks. It necessarily marks a great advance on Skeat's edition of 1894. But it cannot be the definitive edition for a reason that will appear.

The Introduction deals with authorship and title, date, sources, Chaucer's reading, "moral import," and the text. There is a short

valuable Bibliography after the Notes.

There are many useful things in this Introduction, but the power of the book lies mainly in the text and the notes; these can hardly be bettered. The editor seems to have read everything, and with discrimination. Skeat's note in *The Academy* on "Fortuna Maior" (iii. 1420), cut out at the time and pasted in our copy of the Skeat *Chaucer*, is here given.

The section on Sources is a good summary of all that has been written on the subject; but the editor places Guido almost on the same level as Benoit: "He owes to these authorities." Yet, as G. C. Macaulay showed, since all the things that Chaucer here took from either source are in Benoit, and many are not in Guido, the probability is that he took nothing in *Troilus* from Guido. Again, what are we to make of this: "But this does not mean that 'Lollius' is simply another name for Boccaccio. 'Lollius,' it must be remembered, wrote long ago, and in Latin"? Surely it is better to accept Lollius as a deliberate mystification, and to say that he is Boccaccio.

In his Notes, the editor misses the opportunity of connecting

the man in the moon with Cain (i. 1024). The note on iv. 506 is hardly adequate, especially since Skeat misinterpreted the passage: "Well know I that, before I was thus tormented by love, I would have given thee hire rather than thou shouldst have slain me." And in ii. 1735, why all the pother? Why does the editor reject G. C. Macautay's "two crowns of love and of mercy," suggested by Filostrato, ii. stanza 184? Love and mercy were known before the Christian era.

Can none of us solve the "here and howne" of iv. 210, which still remains a crux?

The chief difficulty of Chaucer lies in semantics, in catching the particular shade of meaning of a word, that had a well-defined meaning long before Chaucer and has a well-defined but different meaning to-day—the particular shade of meaning not merely in Chaucer, but in each individual passage in Chaucer. Here Professor Root fails us. He has no glossary. He relies on his Notes, and expects us to rely on Murray's Dictionary! To take one example: the word sely. This is glossed "happy, blessed" in the note on iv. 503. But what is the meaning of "sely Troilus" in ii. 683 (not given in the note)? Certainly not "happy, blessed."

Professor Root has in mind the needs, not only of special students, but also of all readers of Chaucer. We are glad of this; we must point out, however, that the general reader cannot dispense with a glossary, and that for him the notes are inadequate. The notes are good and full, but they are mainly for the "special student." Here are four passages in Book II, each of which, it seems to us, would puzzle the general reader, yet there is not an interpretative note to divide between them.

II. 628-30:

But swich a knightly sight, trewely, As was on hym, was nat, withouten faille, To loke on Mars, that god is of bataille.

II. 677:

Made love withinne hire for to myne.

II. 862:

What is the sonne wers, of kynde right?

II. 1056:

and sory mote he ben his lyve.

A. J. WYATT.

A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions (1578). Edited by Hyder E. Rollins. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1926. [London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.] Pp. xxvi.+246. 21s. net.

WERE it not that the whole series of Elizabethan miscellanies is to a certain extent interdependent, and that for the study of any of them it is important that all should be accessible in correct reprints, it might not unreasonably be questioned whether the Gorgeous Gallery is worth the time and trouble which Professor Rollins has devoted to the preparation of this elaborate edition. The book seems to have met with little success in its own day, and was not reprinted. This indeed is hardly to be wondered at, for the bulk of its contents must even in 1578 have seemed old fashioned, and the very next year, or at latest the early part of 1580, saw the publication of The Shepherd's Calendar and the beginning of a very different school of poetry. Good and careful work, however, always deserves a welcome, whatever its subject, and it is well that the Gorgeous Gallery, small as are its poetical merits, should have been properly edited once for all.

In his Introduction, Professor Rollins says all that is necessary—indeed, perhaps all that can be said with certainty—about the book. As with most other miscellanies of the period, there is doubt about the manner of its compilation. The entry in the Stationers' Register attributes this to a certain R. Williams, about whom nothing is known, the title-page to one T. P., presumably the T. Proctor who adds the "Pretie pamphlets" at the end. There is some likelihood that the rather nebulous Owen Roydon, assumed to be related to the better-known Matthew, was somehow concerned in the inception of the book.

Two other works are attributed to this same Proctor, whom the editor regards as a printer, on the strength of the entry in the Stationers' Register of a Thomas Proctour, apprentice to John Allde, as made free of the company in 1584. This may of course be the same man, but nothing is known of any master printer of the name, and it is at least hazardous to assume, as the editor seems to do, that the "published by T. P." on the title of the Triumph of Truth implies that he printed it or had anything to do with its publication in the modern sense. The phrase surely means no more than the

"Published by A. M." on Munday's Discovery of Edmund Campion. It is of course common enough, and is merely a variant of "written" or "set forth" by.

The text of the present reprint follows the original edition page for page and line for line, representing however black letter by roman, roman by italic and italic by black letter, a circular substitution oddly reminiscent of Grimm's Law, and somewhat puzzling until one perceives the not unreasonable principle, which was evidently to make the smallest use of the type least familiar to the modern reader. In the title-page, headlines, titles of the poems, "finises" and signature-marks, however, the typography of the original is followed, a complication which I cannot but think it would have been better to avoid.

The notes are very full and contain much of value, especially as regards the relation of the Gorgeous Gallery to other poetical work of its period. At the same time I venture to think that they would have been more serviceable to students if the editor had been less lavish of his illustration, extending far beyond the period to which the book belongs, of common proverbs and phrases, and had been at less pains to attempt the interpretation of the very numerous passages which, as they stand, cannot be made to yield any precise sense. In verse of this type, full of common tags and overloaded with alliteration, we must, I think, not infrequently admit that, if the text is correct, the author can have had no clear idea of what he meant to say, and leave it at that.

There is a good index, of words as well as of subjects, and the volume appears to be as a whole a thoroughly competent edition of a bad, but nevertheless not unimportant, book.

R. B. McK.

Queen Elizabeth and a Swedish Princess: being an account of the visit of Princess Cecilia of Sweden to England in 1565. By James Bell. Edited from the MS. by Ethel Seaton. Etchells & Macdonald. Haslewood Books. Pp. 89. 15s. net.

THE editor, or her publisher, vacillates. It is visit on the title-page, but journey on the jacket. The latter is more accurate. Bell's narrative concerns the journey only. But his present editor finishes the story, from State Papers and Swedish authorities, and presents

an adequate account of an episode which is of some interest, though its details are sordid. Very little is known of Bell except that he was of Corpus (Oxon.) and a zealous Protestant. His manuscript, which was written within a year of the visit, is in the King's Library, and was edited in Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc., 1898; but Miss Seaton has corrected a great many mistakes made by the former editor in transcribing place-names. Bell was not an eye-witness of the journey, and though he seems to have been well informed the narrative has hardly any historical value. As a specimen of Elizabethan prose it is doubtless of some interest to experts, but it is as tedious as its brevity permits, and full of sentences which begin: "But as the sonne of Ixione," or the like. Miss Seaton's part is much more amusing, and as a whole the book is not unworthy of its admirable print and binding. It is a small quarto, the text in an old-style italic, the Introduction and notes in roman. My only criticism is that the names printed in capitals (following the MS., no doubt) are too loud-STOCKEHOLLOME fills half a line, and upsets the balance.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

About Shakespeare and his Plays. By G. F. Bradby. Oxford University Press. Pp. 92. 2s. 6d. net.

THERE is more wisdom in Mr. G. F. Bradby's little book than in an average shelf of Shakespeareana. It aims at exposition, not at erudition. It proceeds along familiar paths; but at the end the reader knows the high-roads of Shakespeare's career and the general contours of his mind and art. Mr. Bradby has a fine sense of proportion, a gift for focusing interest on essentials, and a way of summarily dismissing specious perversities which makes him as good at exposure as at exposition. For instance, the question on the lips of the anti-Stratfordians and at the root of all Baconian and other similar heresies, "Is it possible that a rustic could have written the greatest English plays?" is disposed of finally, in two or three lines, as a meaningless question, since humanly speaking it is improbable that any sort of man should have written Shakespeare's plays—but the thing did happen, as Shakespeare's contemporaries sufficiently attest.

0

ir

n

th

German Influence in the English Romantic Period. By F. W. STOKOE. Cambridge University Press. 1926. Pp. x.+202. 12s. 6d. net.

MR. STOKOE has made a valuable contribution to the study of comparative literature, the step-child of the Universities. He has set himself the task of examining in what manner and to what extent interest in German literature was excited in England between the years 1788 and 1818, the latter date marking the revival of interest of a more intelligent type after the enthusiasm for the more sensational literary productions of Germany had died down. Mr. Stokoe concludes what we hope is a preliminary study at the stage where the

way had been prepared for Carlyle.

Before 1750 there was little in German literature to interest the English, for the previous century and a half had been almost barren of works of the imagination, with the one outstanding exception of Grimmelshausen's great novel, Simplicissimus. The century opened with the attempts of Gottsched to base a new movement in German literature on imitation of the French, and it was not till the advent of Lessing, with his realisation that the German mind was more akin to the English and his putting forth of Shakespeare as a model. that the seed was planted for the Blütezeit of the last quarter of the century. It was, of course, Werther that first drew attention in this country to Goethe, and it was mainly as the author of Werther that he was known to the end of his life, though a few people had what was then an expert knowledge of contemporary German literature. Of these the chief propagandists were William Taylor of Norwich and Henry Crabb Robinson, to say nothing of Henry Mackenzie, who read a paper on the German drama before the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1788.

After a valuable general Introduction and an examination of the periodical literature, the author confines his investigations to Scott, Coleridge, Shelley and Byron. With a wealth of detail he studies the poems which may have been inspired or influenced by a reading of German literature, and in other works he finds parallels for incidents important or trivial. We would have been glad to see a more exhaustive treatment of those elements in the psychology of these writers which made them sympathetic to such of the literary productions of Germany by which they were attracted, but

Mr. Stokoe's book will be indispensable for any future study on those lines.

The conclusion is that Scott's connection with German literature. in spite of his translation of Götz, was incidental, and that except for certain hints and information along certain lines, it had little meaning for him. When Coleridge first read Schiller's Die Räuber, in the middle of the night, he wrote immediately to Southey, "My God, Southey, who is this Schiller, this convulser of the heart? . . . I tremble like an aspen leaf. Upon my soul, I write to you because I am frightened. . . . Why have we ever called Milton sublime?" Nevertheless, Mr. Stokoe concludes that his affinities with German writers are much less strongly marked on the literary side than on the philosophical, and the discernible German influence on his writings is in general slight. His translation of Schiller's Wallenstein used to be considered better than the original, an opinion with which Coleridge himself was inclined to agree, and he might have translated Goethe's Faust had Murray made him a more magnanimous offer than his original one of £100. But as Coleridge wrote to the publisher that the parts of his translation of Wallenstein which were most admired were substitutions of his own, it was perhaps wise of Murray not to increase his offer, however much posterity may regret it.

Shelley's interest in German literature was continuous, the deepest impression being made upon him by Faust. Mr. Stokoe's chapter on Byron can profitably be read in conjunction with Professor J. G. Robertson's exhaustive study of the relations of Goethe and Byron, which was reviewed in these columns in January of this

year.

Not the least important part of this book is the voluminous bibliography, and there is an amusing frontispiece showing "some effects of diablerie."

WILLIAM ROSE.

The British Museum Quarterly. London. Published by the Trustees [and sold for them by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London]. Nos. 1-3. 1926. Price 2s. each number.

THE purpose of this excellent quarterly is to call attention to the principal acquisitions of the national collections, by furnishing short

descriptions of each, written by experts but not in too technical language, the description being in suitable cases illustrated by photographs. As is natural, the majority of the acquisitions regarded as meriting full description appeal rather to the student of art than to the student of literature, but in these three parts we find notes on the first draft of Jane Austen's Persuasion, with facsimile of a page showing the numerous corrections, on the MS. of C. M. Doughty's Mansoul, and on Barron Field's Memoir of Wordsworth, the MS. of which has recently been acquired by the Museum. This memoir is not in itself of great importance, but Wordsworth read it, and his marginal comments, some of which have not, it seems, been printed, are of considerable interest. A number of other notes deal with subjects which, if not exactly literary, touch on literature, and the publication is certainly one which should be in every library of importance.

R. B. McK.

Gutenberg to Plantin: An Outline of the Early History of Printing. By George Parker Winship, Librarian of the Harry Elkins Widener Collection, Harvard College Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. [London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.] Pp. xii. +86. Price \$3.

This is a pleasantly written and useful account, intended for the general reader, of the history of printing up to the year 1600. Mr. Winship, one of the best known of American bibliographers, has turned his wide knowledge of all branches of his subject to the production of an outline which, while so far as possible avoiding controversy, should yet give an adequate and consistent account of the story of early printing as it appears in the light of the most recent investigations. In this he has, I think, been very successful. The story is necessarily very much condensed, and as is inevitable in all attempts to summarise a large subject, the reader who comes to it with little or no previous knowledge will find that he must go through it more than once before the events link themselves together in his mind, but to those who have already an acquaintance with examples of some of the more important presses it will prove of great assistance in enabling them to place these in their proper relations. Could something of the nature of a table have been devised to show in

parallel columns the chief presses of the various countries and the principal spheres of their activity it would, I think, have been of even more use as an introduction to its subject. Besides dealing with the general history of the invention and spread of printing, the book has chapters on early book illustration, on the Learned Printers, and on the Patrons of Printing, and contains a number of useful illustrations, including a reproduction of Stradanus' interesting, but I venture to think somewhat fanciful, engraving of an Antwerp printing-house of the end of the sixteenth century. Altogether the book is one which can be warmly recommended to the notice of all literary students who desire a general view of the way in which printing began.

R. B. McK.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

Anglia, Vol. L. (Neue Folge, Vol. XXXVIII.), December 1926—
George Bernard Shaws Beziehungen zu Samuel Butler dem Jüngeren
(Elisabeth Peper), pp. 295-316.
Walter Savage Landor (continued) (Helene Richter), pp. 317-44.
A Study on Early Mediæval York (Harald Lindkvist), pp. 345-94.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, November 1926—
Anthony Trollope and his Mother (Rowland Grey), pp. 557-64.
A Sheaf of Letters from Jane Welsh Carlyle. II. (Leonard Huxley), pp. 622-38.

Additions to Aubrey: Some Notes of 1685 (Dean of Winchester), pp. 666-70.

A Girl's Friendship with John Ruskin (the late Jessie Leete: edited by Leonard Huxley), pp. 750-66.
Continued January 1927, pp. 110-26.

January 1927—
Sir Walter Scott and the West Port Atrocities (D. Fraser-Harris),
pp. 23-32.
Charlotte Bronte's Husband: His Later Life and Surroundings
(H. K. Bell), pp. 42-46.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 61, December 1926—
Ags. nāmon-zēafon (C. Karstien), pp. 1-8.
The Dialect of London in the Thirteenth Century (Percy H. Reaney),
pp. 9-23.
Sprachphilosophische Probleme bei Bacon (O. Funke), pp. 24-56.
James Thomson and the Evolution of Spirits (G. R. Potter), pp. 57-65.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. VIII., December 1926—
"That alle myghtys may" in the Towneley Secunda Pastorum
(J. Vriend), pp. 185-6.

HERRIG'S ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITERA-TUREN, Vol. 151 (New Series 51), October 1926—

Swift's Gulliver's Travels und irische Sagen (F. Mezger), pp. 12-18. Die Gloucestershire-Legende der heiligen Juliane (G. Schleich), pp. 19-51.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXV., October 1926—

Compound Words in Spenser's Poetry (Frederick M. Padelford and William C. Maxwell), pp. 498-516.

James Howell as a Practical Linguist (E. H. Mensel), pp. 531-39.
Carlyle and Jean Paul Friederich Richter (Theodore Geissendoerfer),
pp. 540-53.

LIBRARY, Vol. VII., December 1926-

The Unity of John Norden: Surveyor and Religious Writer (A. W. Pollard), pp. 233-52.

A Hundreth Sundry Flowers (W. W. Greg), pp. 269-82.
Gascoigne's authorship.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XV., November 1926-

Shakespeare and the Quarter Sessions (L. F. Salzman), pp. 46-49. Note on "sucking-doves" by V. Teulon Porter, December, p. 181.

Boswell's Proof-Sheets, I. (R. W. Chapman), pp. 50-58. Concluded, December, pp. 171-80.

On the Poems of Henry Vaughan (Edmund Blunden), pp. 59-75.

——December—

The Lyrical Poems of Thomas Hardy (R. W. King), pp. 157-70.

Mask, Vol. XII. (2), January 1927-

Poetry in Drama (William Poel), pp. 7-9.

Ben Jonson: Inigo Jones: Inventors (Paul McPharlin), pp. 10-14.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLI., November 1926-

Four Notes on the West Midland Dialect (Robert J. Menner), pp. 454-58.

Yord; Final i>e; po (the); hor (their).

Horace Walpole anticipates Victor Hugo (Horatio E. Smith), pp. 458-61.

A Neglected Sixteenth-Century "of-or" Construction (M. P. Tilley), pp. 462-64.

Blake and Browning (Raymond D. Havens), pp. 464-66. Crabb Robinson's Reminiscences and An Epistle of Karshish.

A Note on Beowulf 1231 (Kemp Malone), pp. 466-67.

Two Notes on Senecan Tragedy (Mary V. Braginton), pp. 468-69.
The Até of Locrine; The Senecan Ghost Misrepresented.

A Rhetorical Figure in Shakespeare (R. L. Dunbabin), pp. 469-70.

As You Like It, v. ii. 35 seq.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLI., December, 1926-

The Translations of John Tiptoft (H. B. Lathrop), pp. 496-501.

Denham's supposed Authorship of Directions to a Painter, 1667 (T. H. Banks, Jr.), pp. 502-05.

The Pardoner's Tale: A Mediaeval Sermon (C. O. Chapman), pp. 506-09.

Two Poems by Henry Reynolds (J. N. Douglas Bush), pp. 510-13. Will Kemp and the Commedia dell' Arte (L. B. Wright), pp. 516-20.

Titus and Vespasian (Eleanor G. Clark), pp. 523-27.

Queen Elizabeth and Benedick's "Partridge Wing" (A. Thaler), pp. 527-29.

Much Ado, 11. i. 151-5.

The Home of the Ludus Coventrice (H. Hartman), pp. 530-31.

A Neglected Example of the In Memoriam Stanza (Irene P.McKeehan), pp. 531-32.

L'Allegro, 45-48 (J. L. Brereton), p. 533.

Boethius: Chaucer: Walton: Lydgate (Eleanor P. Hammond), PP 534-35.

Notes on Shakespeare's King John (L. A. Post), p. 535. v. vii. 116-18.

Bede and Pausanias (Nellie S. Aurner), pp. 535-36.

Parallel to Bede's account of Caedmon.

The Pater-Saintsbury Definition of Criticism (T. Stenberg), p. 536.

----Vol. XLII., January 1927-

The Downfall of the Three Unities (Thomas M. Raysor), pp. 1-9. Nathan and Nathaniel Field (R. Florence Brinkley), pp. 10-15.

Dryden's Relations with Howard and Orrery (William S. Clark), pp. 16-20.

Tacitus, Henry VI., Part III., and Nero (Robert S. Forsythe), pp. 25-27.

Some Literary Echoes (Frederick E. Pierce), pp. 27-28.

Duchess of Malfi, IV. ii.; On the Extinction of the Venetian Republic;
Album Verses.

A New Scene in Colley Cibber's Richard III. (Arthur C. Sprague), pp. 29-32.

Amelia, or the Distressed Wife (Roger P. McCutcheon), pp. 32-33.

A Note on the Versification of Childe Harold (Harold Stein), pp. 34-35.

Thomas Middleton's The Viper's Brood (Harold N. Hillebrand),

pp. 35-38.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXII., January 1927-

Three Anglo-Saxon Charms from the Lacnunga (J. H. G. Grattan), pp. 1-6.

For Sudden Stitch; Nine Herbs Charm; Nightmare Charm.

John Marston, Dramatist. Some New Facts about his Life (R. E. Brettle), pp. 7-14.

Bunyan's Mr. Ignorance (John W. Draper), pp. 15-21. The Text of Cowper's *Letters* (K. Povey), pp. 22-27.

Further Notes on *Beowulf* (P. G. Thomas), pp. 70-73. Ll. 358-9, 804, 939, 970-2, 1231, 1537, 1798, 1880, 2394, 2691-2.

Two Newly Found Middle English Texts (Cyril Brett), pp. 73-75. Letter and quatrain now at Whitchurch.

Italian Sources of Lyrics of Thomas Lodge (Alice Walker), pp. 75-79. Vaughan and Cowper (L. C. Martin), pp. 79-84.

Swinburne and Walt Whitman (Georges Lafourcade), pp. 84-86. Some New Arthurian Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library (E. S. Murrell), pp. 87-90.

Notes on the Gothic Calendar (Cod. Ambros. A.) (George Friedrichsen), pp. 90-93.

Ana gutyiudai; bilaif.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIV., November 1926-

An Aspect of the World-Conquest Motif in Literature (N. H. Clement), pp. 129-40.

The Blackfriars Mystery (Hazelton Spencer), pp. 173-80. Note on Pepys' entry for January 29, 1661.

The Influence of Marlowe's Sources on *Tamburlaine I*. (Leslie Spence), pp. 181-99.

Native Elements in English Neo-Classicism (Paul Spencer Wood), pp. 201-08.

Concerning the "Ode on a Grecian Urn" (Raymond D. Havens), pp. 209-14.

Some Revised Etymologies (Francis A. Wood), pp. 215-20.

O.E. batt, buter-fléoge, curs, niht-scada, ælf-pone, pung, tôm, tôh, wergulu; Goth. qairrus, kaurus, taihun, têkan, kunawida; N.E. by hook or crook, temse; O.N. heòinn; Norw. dial., tagg.

Documents and Records (Edith Rickert), pp. 249-56.

1. Extracts from a Fourteenth-Century Account Book (continued).

New Criterion, Vol. V., January 1927— The Criticism of Coleridge (H. P. Collins), pp. 45-56.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. CI., February 1927—
The Unrest in Shakespearean Studies (E. K. Chambers), pp. 255-66.
"The Constant Nymph" and the Musical Novel (H. E. Wortham),
pp. 267-80.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 151, November 13, 1926-

The Authorship of the Two Lamentable Tragedies (S. R. Golding), pp. 347-50.

A South Sea House Associate of Charles Lamb (John M. Turnbull),

Thomas Maynard.

---November 20-

A Blake Reference (K. Povey), p. 368. In a letter from Flaxman, 19.8.1814.

——December 4—

Oliver Goldsmith (Harmatopegos), p. 404. Correction of statement in D.N.B.

——December 11—

Williamscote and Wilcotes (Alfred Ransford), pp. 424-26.

Occurrence as place-name. Continued, December 18, pp. 443-44;

December 25, pp. 461-62.

——December 18—

The Authorship of the "Witch of Edmonton" (H. Dugdale Sykes), pp. 435-38.

Concluded, December 25, pp. 453-57.

London Taverns in the XVII. Century (William McMurray), pp. 438-40.

"Timothy Bobbin" (Victor B. Neuberg), p. 447.
Bibliographical note.

January 1, 1927—

Shadwell and "The Tory Poets" (Roswell G. Ham), pp. 6-8.

The Play which suggested "A Tale of Two Cities" (T. W. Tyrrell), p. 12.

The Frozen Deep, by Wilkie Collins.

January 15—

Textual Notes on Shakespeare (Henry Cuningham), pp. 43-45.

Cymbeline, III. iv. 51; III. iv. 135; III. iv. 149; v. i. 13-15; v. i. 19; v. v. 261.

——January 29—

"Dismissed": "Cashiered" (A. Hutton Radice), p. 84.
Distinction in military use.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VI., January 1927-

Milton and the Conjectura Cabbalistica (Marjorie H. Nicolson), pp. 1-18.

The Forger at Work: A New Case against Collier (Hazelton Spencer), pp. 32-38.

MS. history of the London stage, 1660-1723, in Theatre Collection of Harvard University.

A French Source for John Davies of Hereford's System of Psychology (Ruth L. Anderson), pp. 57-66.

Dealing with the indebtedness of John Davies of Hereford to de la Primaudaye's French Academy. This debt had, however, already been pointed out in R.E.S., i. 244.

The Day Book and Ledger of Wordsworth's Carpenter (Alfred E. Richards), pp. 75-79.

Sources of Poems 48 and 49 in *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* (D. T. Starnes), pp. 87-89.

The Fair Cassio (Harry T. Baker), pp. 89-90. Note on Othello, 1. i. 23.

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, Vol. XLI., December 1926—

Arthur's Round Table (Laura Hibbard Loomis), pp. 771-84. Evidence of Christian origin.

Guillaume de Palerne: A Medieval "Best Seller" (Irene Pettit McKeehan), pp. 785-809.

The Authorship of the Secunda Pastorum (Oscar Cargill), pp. 810-31. Evidence of Gilbert Pilkington's authorship.

The Metres of the Brome and Chester Abraham and Isaac Plays (Margaret Dancy Fort), pp. 832-39.

The Christus Redivivus of Nicholas Grimald and the Hegge Resurrection Plays (George Coffin Taylor), pp. 840-59.

Milton and Servetus: A Study in the Sources of Milton's Theology (Martin A. Larson), pp. 891-934.

Albrecht von Haller and English Theology (Lawrence M. Price), pp. 942-54

E. Th. A. Hoffmann's Reception in England (Erwin G. Gudde), pp. 1005-10.

The Physical Basis of Rime (Henry Lanz), pp. 1011-23.

A Proposed Compromise in Metrics (Charles E. Whitmore), pp. 1024-43.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAINE, Vol. IV., December 1926—

La veine bachique dans le théâtre shakespearien (Émile Legouis),
pp. 97-117.

Translation of British Academy Shakespeare Lecture.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 4, 1927—
Bunyan's "Book for Boys and Girls" (J. E. Hodgson), p. 770.
Discovery of second copy of the First Edition.

Shakespeare's Experience (Anon.), p. 770.

Note on Antony and Cleopatra, v. ii. 4-8; further letters by T. Sturge Moore and J. Dover Wilson, November 11, pp. 797-8; T. Sturge Moore and Anon, November 18, p. 819; K. Funduklian, November 18, p. 868; G. W. R. Knight, December 23, p. 949; J. A. Fort, December 30, p. 961; William Poel, January 13, p. 28.

A Sterne Problem (C. Wanklyn), p. 770. Early edition of Tristram Shandy.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 11-

The Lindisfarne Gospels (George Taylor), p. 797. History of the manuscript.

Wordsworth's Lucy (George McLean Harper), p. 797. Further letter by Émile Legouis, December 9, p. 913.

----November 18-

Blake's "Infant Sorrow" (Max Plowman), p. 819.

November 25-

Wordsworth and Plato (H. E. Cookson), p. 868.

——December 2—

Carlell's Plays (Allardyce Nicoll), p. 888.

Richard Graves and Bath (W. H. Hutton), p. 888. Reply by B. T. K. Smith, December 9, p. 913.

Poetry of Toil (A.), p. 888.

Soldiers' songs. Reply by Harold Johnson, December 9, p. 913. Note on Roman soldiers' song by Katherine M. Buck, December 16, p. 935; on Norse whetstone-song by E. M. Gathorne-Hardy, December 30, p. 961.

——December 9—

William Blake and Josiah Wedgwood (Geoffrey Keynes), p. 909. Note by Bernard Rackham, December 16, p. 935.

——December 16—

"Godeleef my wyf" (Edith Rickert), p. 935.

Note on Canterbury Tales, B. 3084; further note by H. G. Richardson,
January 20, p. 44.

Hazlitt: Sienkiewicz (Kenneth B. Schofield), p. 935.

Life of Napoleon and Ségur's Histoire de Napoleon: Quo Vadis. Reply by Edvige Koznitowicz (née Sienkiewicz), January 6, p. 12.

Gray's Elegy: The Fourth Edition (Francis Griffin Stokes), p. 935.

——December 23—

Hugh Singleton (Henry R. Plomer), p. 949. Further biographical details.

Chaldean Hippo-Centaurs in the Revelation (C. R. Haines), p. 949.
Further notes by Arthur S. Peake, December 30, p. 961; C. R. Enock,
January 6, p. 12; Arthur S. Peake, January 13, p. 28.

Donne's Anatomie (Noel Douglas), p. 949. Bibliographical note. Times Literary Supplement, January 6, 1927— Marlowe and As You Like It (J. Dover Wilson and O. W. F. Lodge),

p. 12.

A Forbidden Song (Harold Burrows and W. N. H. Harding), p. 12. Street ballad on "pressing" of seamen.

Beowulf (R. F. Rattray), p. 12. Symbolic elements.

——January 13—

A Forgotten Salisbury Surgeon (J. Paul de Castro), p. 28. Edward Goldwyre and Amelia. Further notes by J. P. de Castro and Herbert Druitt, January 27, p. 60.

Clement Perkes of the Hill (S. T. H. Parkes), p. 28. Entries in Halesowen parish registers.

___January 20-

"Fade" in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (C. T. Onions), p. 44.
Reply by Kenneth Sisam, January 27, p. 60.

Carlyle on Novels (James A. S. Barrett), p. 44.

Authorship of two articles in Fraser's Magazine.

Pugh, the Welsh Poet (H. Ince Anderton), p. 44. Biographical note.

The Mermaide Tavern (T. C. Dale), p. 60.

